DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 934 SO 030 130

TITLE	Roundtable Series II. Proceedings Report.
INSTITUTION	Getty Center for Education in the Arts, Los Angeles, CA.
PUB DATE	88
NOTE	158p.; For a related document, see SO 030 133.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Art Criticism; *Art Education; Art Expression; Art History; *Artists; *Curriculum Development; *Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Fine Arts; Museums; Visual Arts
IDENTIFIERS	*Discipline Based Art Education; Getty Center for Education in the Arts

ABSTRACT

This report documents the proceedings from the second series of regional roundtable discussions sponsored by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts. These roundtables were established to provide a forum in which people could discuss aspects of Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE). The topics of these roundtables were as follows: Roundtable I (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, November 13, 1987), "The Roles of the Art Specialist in Discipline-Based Art Education" (Kellene Champlin; Mary Erickson); Roundtable II (Milwaukee, Wisconsin, April 22, 1988), "The Roles of the Museum Educator in Discipline-Based Art Education" (Danielle Rice; Lee Devereux); and Roundtable III (Tulsa, Oklahoma, May 6, 1988), "The Roles of the Artist-in-the-Schools in Discipline-Based Art Education" (Joseph Goldyne; Richard Bell). Each roundtable was attended by approximately 40 invited guests, including art educators, educational leaders, school administrators, museum educators, artists, arts administrators, and others. Following the two keynote speakers, roundtable participants subsequently engaged in day-long discussions and made recommendations for more effective strategies to strengthen art education in the nation's schools. The book contains a foreword by Leilani Duke, executive summaries and reports on each roundtable session. Two appendices are included, one supplies the complete addresses of the keynote speakers; the other lists all the participants who attended the three roundtables. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

P R O C E E D I N G S R E P O R T

ED382934

Roundtable Series II

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

VICKIE J. ROSENBERG

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Sponsored by
The Getty Center for Education in the Arts

SO 030 130

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Proceedings Report:

ROUNDTABLE SERIES II

Sponsored by

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts

© 1988 The J. Paul Getty Trust

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts
1875 Century Park East, Suite 2300
Los Angeles, California 90067

Roundtable proceedings prepared by

KEENS COMPANY
261 West Fourth Street #23
New York, New York 10014
212/929-7432

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	i
Executive Summaries	1
Roundtable I	9
Roundtable II	39
Roundtable III	65
Appendix A: Texts of Addresses	93
Kellene Champlin	95
Mary Erickson	103
Danielle Rice	111
Lee Devereux	119
Joseph Goldyne	127
Richard Bell	135
Appendix B: Lists of Participants	145
Roundtable I	147
Roundtable II	153
Roundtable III	155
Acknowledgments	158

FOREWORD

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts recently sponsored its second series of regional roundtable discussions. These roundtables are among the advocacy programs of the Center and were established to provide a forum in which people could discuss aspects of discipline-based art education (DBAE).

The initial roundtable series consisted of meetings in Boston, Seattle, New Orleans, and Chicago in 1985 and 1986. They were designed to elicit participants' reactions to Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools, the first publication of the Getty Center. The second roundtable series, summarized in this document, focused on the roles of various professionals in DBAE. The topics, locations, and dates of these roundtables were as follows:

Roundtable I: "The Roles of the Art Specialist in Discipline-Based Art Education"
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
November 13, 1987

Roundtable II: "The Roles of the Museum Educator in Discipline-Based Art Education"
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
April 22, 1988

Roundtable III: "The Roles of the Artist-in-the-Schools in Discipline-Based Art Education"
Tulsa, Oklahoma
May 6, 1988

Each roundtable was attended by approximately forty invited guests, including art educators, educational leaders, school administrators, museum educators, artists, arts administrators, and others. Two professionals

addressed each topic. Roundtable participants subsequently engaged in day-long discussions and made recommendations for more effective strategies to strengthen art education in the nation's schools. These recommendations and how to implement them are being considered by the Center.

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts was established in 1982 as one of seven operating entities of the J. Paul Getty Trust. Its mission is to improve the quality and status of art education in the nation's schools. Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE), which underlies all of the Center's initiatives, is based on the premise that art education must integrate the ideas, skills, knowledge, and creative activity derived from four art disciplines: studio art, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. Furthermore, art content should be presented in the form of written, sequential curricula that enables students to develop their creative abilities for making art (studio art), to respond to and appreciate the qualities of visual imagery (art criticism), to understand art's cultural and historical contexts (art history), and to raise questions about the nature of art and make informed artistic judgments (aesthetics).

The Center pursues its mission and these goals through five programs:

* advocacy for the value of art and art education
* professional development for teachers and administrators in schools and universities
* theory development for the encouragement of scholarly work in DBAE
* demonstration programs to apply DBAE in the classroom
* curriculum development in DBAE

In each of these areas, the Center contributes to the field by acting as a catalyst for and supporting the work of others. In the advocacy program, it focuses on providing parents, school administrators, teachers, and others with compelling arguments on behalf of arts education to present to policy makers at the federal, state, and local levels. The Center's national conference in Los Angeles in January 1987, entitled "Discipline-Based Art Education: What Forms Will It Take?" provided an opportunity for participants from throughout the United States to learn more about DBAE and to see a form of it in action in Los Angeles-area classrooms. Publication of the proceedings of this conference and other Center events enables the advocacy program to share ideas with a large and diverse audience.

Another advocacy effort is in the area of television, which is a potentially important tool for increasing awareness and knowledge of the arts among young people. The Getty Center, in partnership with the National Endowment for the Arts, is sponsoring research and development for a proposed television series that will demonstrate some of the fundamental principles of the arts to children eight to eleven years old, using major works and prominent artists in both the visual and performing arts.

In the area of professional development, the Center has supported for six years the Getty Institute for Educators in the Visual Arts, which operates a summer institute and school-year curriculum implementation program in twenty-one Los Angeles school districts. This pilot in-service research and development project is yielding considerable information about the opportunities and the problems in helping teachers to use the principles of

DBAE. The Center has announced the award of contracts to ten universities throughout the country to help build and strengthen their preservice art education programs with an emphasis on DBAE. These professional development projects are expected to result in new core courses, curriculum materials, and faculty development. The projects will be based on work that was begun at a week-long seminar, "The Preservice Challenge," which took place at Snowbird, Utah, in August 1987, and in which fifteen university teams of art educators, studio artists, art critics, art historians, and aestheticians took part.

The Center nurtures DBAE theory development by commissioning essays and monographs and by conducting seminars for academicians from art education, the art disciplines, and related fields. It also publishes a series of occasional papers written by eminent scholars discussing issues relevant to art education and DBAE.

The district grant program represents the Center's involvement in demonstration programs. Matching grants go to school districts that embrace a wide range of activities, including workshops and institutes for training school staff, the creation or adaptation of DBAE curriculum materials for both elementary and secondary grades, and the assessment of student achievement. The district grant program is reaching completion, and a multi-year study is planned to assess the results of this initiative.

Also in this area, a new program makes it possible for consortia of school districts, teacher education institutions, and museums to develop their own

summer institutes. The program was launched in the summer of 1988 at various sites around the country. Grants have been awarded for intensive training in the theory and application of DBAE for school district teams comprised of art specialists, teachers, principals, superintendents, and school board members.

Finally, the Center has embarked on a new initiative in curriculum development through its sponsorship of the first Curriculum Development Institute for art specialists. This program is intended to produce model or sample DBAE units for elementary, middle, and secondary grades -- prototypes that may stimulate further curriculum development in school districts, state departments of education, university art education programs, and among commercial publishers.

All of the Center's programs are developed in consultation and cooperation with recognized experts in art education and related fields. In carrying them out, the Center has sought to collaborate with school districts, universities, museums, and local, state, and national art and educational agencies. Much has been accomplished, much work remains, but with the valuable and focused participation of the field that the roundtables made possible, our mutual goals are within reach.

Leilani Lattin Duke
Director
The Getty Center for Education in the Arts

ROUNDTABLE SERIES II

Executive Summaries

EXECUTIVE SUMMARIES

ROUNDTABLE I: "The Roles of the Art Specialist in Discipline-Based Art Education"

Initial presentations were made by Kellene Champlin, Director of Art Education for the Fulton County (Georgia) Board of Education and Dr. Mary Erickson, Professor of Art Education at Pennsylvania's Kutztown University.

Champlin contended that the majority of classroom teachers cannot be expected to possess a background enabling them to respond to the demands of DBAE. While these classroom generalists should be educated in the concepts of DBAE, Champlin sees a dire need to educate the art specialist at all levels more thoroughly and comprehensively, since it is the integrated approach to thinking about and teaching the four DBAE disciplines that makes this approach so valuable to the field. To make DBAE instruction successful, art specialists must understand the concept, be able to translate it into written curriculum, learn to evaluate the outcomes of their instruction, and generally become proficient in its implementation. Furthermore, a balance among the four DBAE disciplines enables art education to serve as a springboard for the exploration of important cultural themes in this increasingly multi-ethnic diverse population.

Erickson described art specialists as a diverse group, adding that the roles they can play in DBAE must take different forms. She also said that the art specialist's role is dramatically different in elementary school, middle school, and secondary school. She then discussed the roles of the

art experts in the four DBAE disciplines: the art content expert, who is proficient in the craft of art-making and can play a role in the schools either directly through teaching or indirectly through assistance and supervision of classroom teachers; the art curriculum expert, who must understand the goals of DBAE and strive to develop a curriculum that is well articulated, balanced, and sequential; the art instruction expert, charged with developing methods and resources aimed at teaching the new content; and the art administrator, whose management skills will ensure that a discipline-based curriculum is available for all students.

In the discussion that followed, roundtable participants sought to define the term "art specialist." At issue were questions of certification, the training of art teachers as artists, and the centrality of the art curriculum. Participants also addressed the nature of DBAE, the "readiness" of our educational systems to implement it, and its current educational context. The question of context included consideration of the environment into which DBAE will be placed, who will be responsible for implementation, what their roles will be, and what is needed for them to succeed.

After meeting in small groups, participants presented their recommendations to the Center in the areas of curriculum development and materials, communication and publicity, and funding.

ROUNDTABLE II: "The Roles of the Museum Educator in Discipline-Based Art Education"

Initial presentations were made by Danielle Rice, Curator of Education for the Philadelphia Museum of Art, and Lee Devereux, Head of Public and Volunteer Activities for the Huntington Library Art Collections in San Marino, California.

Rice examined the museum as an environment for DBAE and discussed some provocative issues related to museum education and art education. She noted that the benefits of DBAE to museums are fairly obvious, since it demands a greater knowledge and sensitivity on the part of teachers as it simultaneously develops the analytical skills and aesthetic understanding of future museum-goers. However, she suggested that museums may be best suited to teaching the analytical skills most often associated with aesthetics and art criticism, while reinforcing classroom-learned skills associated with art history and studio practice.

Devereux discussed more practical considerations regarding what it means to work with school personnel, teachers, and students who have been through an intensive staff development program on DBAE in the Los Angeles area. She contended that museums, as repositories of original works of art, should operate in partnership with educational institutions to promote DBAE, and she described the accomplishments of the Huntington, which has been working with the Getty Institute for Educators in the Visual Arts for the past five years to promote DBAE in the Los Angeles-area public schools.

During discussion, each roundtable participant was asked to identify the primary enhancing and/or inhibiting factors with regard to the role of the museum educator in DBAE. Having identified these factors, participants then organized the inhibiting factors into four related groups: 1) resources, access, and networks; 2) policies and procedures; 3) attitudes, values, and concepts; and 4) training and implementation. The goal was to address those factors that need to be overcome if museums are to be as effective as possible in helping to implement DBAE.

Toward this end, participants met in small groups to identify various ways in which the inhibiting factors might be resolved or at least neutralized, then reported their ideas and recommendations in plenary session.

ROUNDTABLE III: "The Roles of the Artist-in-the-Schools in Discipline-Based Art Education"

Initial presentations were made by Joseph Goldyne, a San Francisco artist, and Richard Bell, National Program Director for Young Audiences.

Acknowledging his bias for the act of creating in art education, Goldyne noted that the other three disciplines in DBAE are dependent upon works of art having been created in the first place. Thus, while there is more to art education than just creating, that "more" has its basis in the creative act. Contact and exchange of ideas between artists and children is essential to understanding the value of the arts in civilization, he asserted. Artists in the classroom should preserve and nurture a child's sense of magic; they should deal with "great visual ideas"; and they should teach children how to react positively to "accidents" -- a basic lesson with applicability in all of the humanities and sciences, as well as in daily life.

Speaking at length about Toward Civilization, the report on arts education recently released by the National Endowment for the Arts, Bell summarized the present state of arts education and the critical issues facing the field. He noted that although the need to establish the arts as a required subject is being recognized, basic literacy in the arts is too rarely expected as an outcome. Further exacerbating the lack of effectiveness is the disunity of the arts community. Responsibility for this state of affairs belongs not only to the arts community: a more compelling case

needs to be made at all levels for including artists and arts organizations at the center of educational reform, and arts leaders need to respond to specific recommendations about the role of artists in this process. Bell concluded with a series of recommendations to the arts community designed to facilitate the kind of discussion that he sees as necessary.

The roundtable participants then identified various constraining and enhancing factors in DBAE with regard to the roles of artists-in-the-schools. The inhibiting factors were organized under four headings that facilitated small-group discussion. These were: 1) resources; 2) understanding and training on the part of artists going into the educational system; 3) understanding and training on the part of the educational community; and 4) program design and administration. Finally, participants reported on their recommendations in a concluding plenary session.

ROUNDTABLE I

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
November 13, 1987

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The program was opened by Stephen Mark Dobbs, Senior Program Officer for the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, who welcomed those present and introduced Peter Solmssen, president of the University of the Arts.

Peter Solmssen described the role and purpose of the University of the Arts, the first university in the United States devoted exclusively to study in the arts. The university combines the strengths of some very historic institutions: the Philadelphia College of Art, Philadelphia College of the Performing Arts, and the Schubert Theater, which will be the home of several important performing arts groups. Furthermore, the university hopes to develop affiliations with independent artistic organizations. Joint programming with the American Music Theater Festival is the first such example.

Essentially, the university's goal is to provide an advanced education in the arts while offering other activities that parallel research in a traditional university. Art education is a vital part of the university's program, so Solmssen had a special interest in the topic of the day: "The Role of the Art Specialist in Discipline-Based Art Education."

Dobbs then provided a context for the roundtable and introduced the two speakers of the day: Kellene N. Champlin, director of art education for the Fulton County (Georgia) Board of Education; and Dr. Mary Erickson, professor of art education at Kutztown University in Pennsylvania.

SUMMARY OF ADDRESS BY KELLENE CHAMPLIN

Before discussing the specific roles of the art specialist, Kellene Champlin sought to provide a context, or frame of reference, for art education and the art specialist in the school system, through which general roles would become apparent. She addressed four questions illustrating the concepts behind discipline-based art education (DBAE):

1) Do children have to learn different ways to manipulate a pencil or crayon or brush prior to making marks with it? Champlin feels that children should learn how to use these tools if art-making is to be seen as a skill with which to realize the intent of creative drawing or painting; this is not necessary, of course, if the intent is simply play.

2) Do children have to know how, where, and when artists have used these tools in order to make drawings that effectively communicate their own thoughts, ideas, and feelings? According to Champlin, children should have some knowledge of these matters if they are to understand the content of their work in relation to their culture and to recognize that art is a vehicle of communication in other cultures throughout the world.

3) Do children have to know terms and strategies in order to tell what is "good" about a work of art? Yes, they do, if their perceptual abilities are to be expanded so that they can incorporate more consciously in their own artwork the meanings they intend to convey. This is also helpful in recognizing and understanding the intent of other artists.

4) Do children have to think about why artists might have drawn and painted what they did in order to make drawings and paintings of their own that please them? This isn't necessary to make a "pleasing" drawing or painting. But reflection on works of art opens up new and very important areas of thinking based on values and the ability to make judgments. This kind of thinking can be translated to other aspects of life, as well.

Champlin noted that these questions are important if we are to provide children with an art education as opposed to simply "having art class." And although some classroom teachers have the talent, ability, and training to teach art competently, many are at a real disadvantage in the background they bring to acquiring new and substantive information about teaching art in the classroom.

As director of art education in Fulton County, Georgia, Champlin has had to think long and hard about the need for art specialists within her school system. The Getty Center's version of DBAE, as well as compatible goals laid down by the National Art Education Association (NAEA), have provided the basis for the two strongest arguments for more art specialists: 1) a depth of understanding of the sociohistorical background of a discipline is necessary to avoid unwittingly undermining that discipline; and 2) "any school subject that the majority of mothers and fathers can't help with at home ought to be taught by specialists."

The majority of classroom teachers cannot be expected to possess the background that would enable them to deal with the rigors and demands of

discipline-based art education. Champlin sees no problem in continuing to educate the classroom generalist in the DBAE concept, but she also sees a dire need to educate the art specialist at all levels more thoroughly and comprehensively in DBAE. While specialists may be quite familiar with the four component disciplines, it is the integrated approach to thinking about and teaching those disciplines that makes DBAE so valuable to the field.

Champlin briefly discussed various aspects of her school system's program that have been affected by DBAE and the NAEA goals.

When interviewing prospective applicants, for instance, a major point of judgment on her part is the degree of familiarity with and desire to implement DBAE and to pursue the NAEA goals. In addition to being spokespersons for DBAE, art specialists are expected to be able to incorporate the four components in their instruction and to be accountable for the objectives that are specified for each of the NAEA goal areas. A monitoring system is currently being devised to provide for evaluation of both the elementary art education curriculum and instruction.

In addition, art specialists within Champlin's system will be the primary developers of "test banks" for each level. She believes that those aspects of art content that are testable ought to be tested, just as in any other subject. Specialists will also be designing other means for making qualitative judgments about the learning of content for which traditional forms of testing are not appropriate.

Summary of Address by Kellene Champlin

Recognizing the real content in art education, her school system has instituted a related graduation requirement, which is presently for a year of credit in the fine arts, a foreign language, or computers. She hopes that as high school art teachers become more proficient in DBAE, they will be able to convince the board of education to consider a fine arts requirement independent of any other. In preparation for this, they are designing art education courses along the lines of foundation or survey courses and are seeking good textbooks to supplement these courses. All studio courses emphasizing art production will also integrate to varying degrees the disciplines of art history, art criticism, and aesthetics.

Finally, last year her school system initiated a program called "writing-across-curriculum," which provides students with the time and support for reflection about questions of art criticism and aesthetics.

Champlin believes that a better balance among the disciplines will allow art education to serve as a springboard for the exploration of cultural themes that are important issues in our increasingly multiethnic and culturally diverse population. A sharing of ideas and feelings is more likely to occur when art criticism and aesthetic considerations are given equal emphasis with art production.

Champlin concluded by saying that the roles of the art specialist in DBAE at all levels are numerous and critical. The specialists must first accept the premises of the DBAE concept, then become confident and proficient in

its implementation. They are charged with understanding the concept, with translating it into written curriculum, with evaluating the outcomes of their instruction, and, finally, with making DBAE work successfully through that instruction.

SUMMARY OF ADDRESS BY MARY ERICKSON

In order to determine what roles the art specialist can or should play in discipline-based art education, Mary Erickson feels it is important to understand that there are many different kinds of art specialists. A partial list includes:

1) artist-teachers who produce and exhibit their own artwork;
2) art therapists who address the various needs of students;
3) service-oriented specialists such as set decorators and sign painters;
4) traditional studio specialists who were trained primarily in art production; and
5) emerging art specialists who take a broader approach to art education and are better trained in the DBAE disciplines.

Furthermore, the art specialist's role is dramatically different in high school, middle school, and elementary school. At the secondary level, a major distinction lies between the teacher of required art courses and the teacher of elective art courses. At the elementary level, major differences exist among degrees of direct teaching versus supervisory responsibility. Art specialists are a diverse group, and the roles they can play in discipline-based art education must take different forms.

Erickson then discussed the roles of art specialists in the implementation of discipline-based art education. Implementing DBAE, much like implementing any other new approach, requires filling certain roles. She

identified four key roles that must be filled: art-content expert, art-curriculum expert, art-instruction expert, and art administrator.

The Role of the Art-Content Expert

Whereas a district can expect from its teachers a certain base-level knowledge of mathematics, science, English, and history, it can expect virtually no expertise in the areas of art criticism, art history, or aesthetics and only minimal experience in art production. Art-content specialists have a major role to play here, particularly at the secondary level. In-service training -- such as staff development workshops, professional conferences, and graduate education -- is necessary for specialists who have limited understanding of the four discipline components. As existing art specialists become more broadly trained, their role as content experts can increase in schools, either directly through teaching or indirectly through assistance and supervision of classroom teachers. It makes sense that these art specialists be encouraged and supported in order to fill the role of art-content experts within a district.

The Role of the Art-Curriculum Expert

Art specialists have been responsible for developing the art curricula in many districts, but those curricula are not always well articulated, balanced, or sequential. There must be someone who understands DBAE's goals, who understands scope and sequence, who has knowledge of children's artistic development in all four disciplines, and who is competent in curriculum writing. Art specialists already in the field can play a

significant role in developing discipline-based art curricula. To do so, however, they must understand the fuller expectations of discipline-based art education, including sequencing, articulation through and across grades, balance among the disciplines, and the integration of all four disciplines without domination by any one of them.

If in-service art specialists are to contribute to discipline-based curriculum development, they will need training in the disciplines with which they are inexperienced. As preservice art education changes, the curriculum development role of the art specialist should change as well. As prospective art specialists are introduced to commercially available curricula, as they develop values and inquiry skills and acquire knowledge in all four art disciplines, and as they study the components of a discipline-based approach to curriculum, the role of the art specialist in curriculum should increase dramatically.

The Role of the Art-Instruction Expert

Since discipline-based art education requires instruction in content not traditionally taught, there is an increased demand for the generation of particular lesson plans, motivational techniques, and activities aimed at teaching the new content. Resources are also needed to support the new instruction, and evaluation techniques are required to assess whether the new content has been learned.

Erickson believes that art specialists have considerable experience that is useful in developing art instruction methods and resources. Valuable

instructional skills developed at the university level include working independently, generating a variety of solutions to a problem, integrating many variables, and evaluating the success of choices made. Effective art specialists assist students in developing curiosity, fluency, a capacity to experiment, the courage to take risks, and the independence necessary to bring an original idea to completion. More so than most teachers, art specialists are experienced in inventing lessons, activities, and resources, since historically there has been little alternative but to do so.

In-service training is necessary for art specialists who have not been trained in art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. However, if art specialists were encouraged to transfer their traditional art-classroom values to a broader range of art content, exciting new instructional methods and resources would emerge. As preservice art specialists are provided with a discipline-based approach, they should be able to marry traditional art specialists' instructional skills with the new challenges of DBAE.

The Role of the Art Administrator

Districts need personnel who understand DBAE and have the management skills to see that a discipline-based curriculum is available for all students. Administrators should be capable of effective communication within the school and the community. Both school personnel and community members must come to understand how and why art education is changing in the district,

and an effective art administrator can play a support role in this process. Administrative support must also be available to coordinate the activities of art specialists and to implement curriculum changes throughout a district.

Evidence of ongoing, national recognition of the need for art specialists to broaden their skills is evident in the increased attention being given to discipline-based art education in professional journals and at professional conferences. The crucial roles discussed here in discipline-based art education can be effectively and efficiently filled by art specialists. Erickson concluded by urging districts to consider the potential contributions that experienced art specialists and newly trained, more broadly based art specialists have to offer. She pointed out the helpfulness of several Getty Center publications in providing scholarly support for a discipline-based approach to art education. Erickson also noted that the Getty-supported regional institute project, now under way, should provide several examples of DBAE to which districts can look for alternative models to guide their decision-making process.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q: (Nancy Brookschmitz) Regarding preservice training, how can teachers be more effectively prepared in the four components of DBAE?

A: (Mary Erickson) State certification requirements in Pennsylvania have been a helpful tool in overhauling existing systems. As one of the largest art education preparatory programs, Kutztown has had to make some very difficult decisions about how to teach DBAE. As a result, we now have a stronger focus on art history, as well as a strong criticism course. We also present theories of aesthetics at more than one level; courses that develop and test teachers' ability to prepare activities in each discipline area; and opportunities to coordinate with school districts in implementing DBAE through student teaching. Another tough area was convincing colleagues at the university level that the values they had committed their lives to are not suddenly expendable, but in fact are just as vital for good discipline-based instruction.

A: (Kellene Champlin) Perhaps the Getty Center should think of in-service for university art education faculty -- that's where it should start.

Q: (Portia Sperr) Kellene, how would you make the argument in favor of teaching somthing that is not generally understood?

A: (Champlin) I believe that art is a most important thing to learn, but it's hard to expect to convince everyone else of that view. I have made the point, however, that art education could be the core of an entire curriculum -- teaching "thinking" kinds of skills that children don't get in minimal, objective-based education that focuses on basics.

Q: (Prabha Sahasrabudhe) Are you making a distinction between a teacher of art and a teacher of art education?

A: (Erickson) When one says there is art in a school, it often just means that there's tempera paint. It is important to recognize the educational component. There are many people who confuse putting art in a school with art education. The former is a wonderful thing, but it's not the same as art education, which is a discipline in itself.

Q: (John Straus) Kellene, how many of your 63 specialists are artists?

A: (Champlin) Two years ago we had an exhibit called "The Artist in the Art Teacher," and we got one or two pieces from every one of the (then) forty-eight specialists. Most of our specialists are producing artists.

Q: (Elaine Weinstone) As a university moves with deliberate speed in giving instruction in DBAE, should we be concerned that local school districts and communities will not move as quickly?

A: (Champlin) In my experience, not only is DBAE received in our school system, but we've found it to be our strongest argument in support of art specialists. I make it clear to my teachers that we are long past the point of isolating ourselves in the corner of a room somewhere; we are part of a national arts community and must interact with it.

A: (Erickson) I want to acknowledge the efforts of the Getty Center in this respect. Thanks to them, administrators are being won over.

Q: (Ron Topping) If you increase discipline expectations, where do you get the time to teach this additional content?

A: (Champlin) There is time if you effectively integrate the four components. The point is not to do art history one week, then art criticism the next, and so on. For instance, a teacher working with pinch pots can talk about where clay comes from, who might have used it and when. That brings in art history. In decorating the pots, that teacher might talk about which colors and patterns to use, which opens the door to a discussion of aesthetics. And so on.

Q: (Harry Bonelli) Kellene, could you elaborate on the testing aspect of your program?

A: (Champlin) There are a lot of things in art history that are cognitive and can be tested -- I'm not talking about dates but about relationships, for example, between styles or events. These can have right and wrong answers and can be tested as such. Now, much of what we work with does not have right and wrong answers and should be tested differently. But if we can design criteria that relies on a professional teacher's judgment, then we can look for indicators.

Q: (Marsha Friedmutter) We've been talking about training or retraining the art specialist. Might there be any place in preservice training for the general elementary teacher to introduce more awareness or knowledge of art education?

A: (Erickson) Yes. This is an artistically illiterate society. In order to change that, art should be introduced into the preservice training

of all teachers, including nonart teachers. I'm involved with a consortium that has proposed an implementation grant for staff development in eastern Pennsylvania. Participating teams would include the art teacher as the central person, a principal, and a general classroom teacher from each of the schools that the art teacher serves. We find that the classroom teachers get very excited about the art content of DBAE; they want to learn more about how to help develop thinking skills, good dialogue, and discussions about abstract ideas in their own classrooms.

A: (Champlin) In our program called "writing-across-curriculum," we have found that teachers in other areas of study have latched onto the art content because it is so fruitful. English teachers, for example, are coming to art teachers for writing assignments for their kids. It's a matter of putting real content into their writing while improving their skills.

Q: (Sue Rosenthal) Along those lines, do you see plans developing for working with teachers to coordinate art history, for example, with the content of English literature or social studies?

A: (Champlin) Absolutely. It's critically important that other subject areas borrow as much from art education as we can borrow from them.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In opening the roundtable to discussion, the facilitator asked those present to focus on the role of the art specialist in DBAE, emphasizing those factors that inhibit or support the specialist.

However, discussion began with a more basic consideration: how the term "art specialist" should be defined. At issue were questions of certification, the training of art teachers as artists, and the centrality of art in the curriculum.

Fred Bacon observed that "one can't be a specialist in any field without thoroughly understanding it," which led him to think of the art specialist as someone trained as an artist first. Marsha Friedmutter echoed Bacon's view but extended her definition to include any teacher "involved in art by training and experience." But she cautioned that to speak in terms of "specialists" may be to set art and art teachers apart from the mainstream educational experience.

Carol Parsinen agreed, adding that the term "specialist" suggests that art is special in that it is not basic, not part of the core curriculum. If art has disciplinary boundaries that make it analogous to the humanities and sciences, she said, then the notion of a specialist suggests "someone on the periphery, not in the center." Likewise, we are in danger of eroding the discipline boundary of art if we allow it to become a

peripheral feature of other core subjects -- for example, to stimulate writing assignments in English or to illustrate geometric shapes in math.

To others present, it was more fruitful to speak in terms of certification, a criterion that many -- but not all -- felt should apply to art teachers. Thus, artists-in-residence may be specialists, said Ron Topping, but that doesn't mean that they are certified to teach art to children. John McLaughlin also asserted that our terminology has to be as consistent as possible with what others in education use and understand; thus, a specialist is one who is certified in a particular area.

Thomas Hatfield cited several of NAEA's goals in addressing this question. One is that art instruction be conducted by teachers certified in art "through a recognized certification process." Another holds that "an acceptable course in visual arts shall include in-depth study in the techniques of at least one art medium, practice in several media, and studies in art history, aesthetics, and criticism." A third states that "every state and school system shall have a [certified] supervisor or administrator to coordinate and direct the visual arts program."

Even on these points, agreement was not unanimous. Elaine Weinstone pointed out that while certification is a good general criterion, it is not required of independent school teachers in Pennsylvania. Indeed, some of the best such teachers are not certified. If this standard of competence were applied universally, what would become of these professionals?

Bringing this topic to closure, Clyde McGeary, Susan Rodriguez, and James Gervan argued for recognizing as valid the differences of opinion that exist and moving on.

McGeary reiterated two points that he said came through in the discussion. The first is that, when thinking of a program on a national scale, we should be aware that there are terminologies, plural, which go hand-in-hand with protocols, also plural. ("Protocols," McGeary said, could be defined as laws, traditions, and procedures that govern the working relationships among institutions, agencies, and individuals.) The second point is that on a national, regional, or urban level, we're dealing with many different people with different educational backgrounds and commitments; in this context, a word used inappropriately or erroneously can "lock us out" from communication with, and support of, others.

Added Rodriguez, "we have all dealt with the problem of status, and we are all sensitive to terms," but it would be a loss to spend all our time discussing terminology. Gervan also urged that the group generally accept the terms (art specialist, art educator, art teacher, artist-teacher) and focus more on the topic. He proposed "a way of thinking about DBAE that we might all accept: DBAE must have discourse and development, discourse and discovery, discourse and display -- but not discourse alone."

With these comments, roundtable participants began to address the nature of DBAE, the "readiness" of our educational systems to implement it, and the current educational context for it.

Marsha Friedmutter raised the issue of what DBAE is when she said that, as an art educator for 23 years, she doesn't see anything new in the concept. Making relationships, getting students to talk about their own art and the work of others -- these were things that she and many art teachers have always done.

Mary Erickson responded to Friedmutter by noting that the Getty Center did not claim to have invented the first discipline-based approach to art education. However, the center's version is "a variation on an old idea" in that it includes the study of aesthetics, employs written curriculum, and is intended for districtwide implementation. In these respects at least, she suggested, "there are some differences."

David Campbell prefaced his comments with a quote from Alfred North Whitehead: "The art of progress is to preserve order amid change and change amid order." He was having "a difficult time discerning whether we are in a time of change needing order, or of order needing change," Campbell said. This was important because the "marketing strategy" to sell DBAE will differ accordingly. Even if we devise a successful strategy, do we have a "state of readiness up and down the organizational ladder" in our school systems? Can we incorporate DBAE successfully?

Mary Erickson observed that "we're not all in the same place," but the fact that we are in different states of readiness "shouldn't impede forward movement." Sue Rosenthal agreed, adding that even if everyone were in the

same readiness state, "we come from so many different systems that we might not agree on anything."

Prabha Sahasrabudhe asserted that the field is indeed ready for DBAE. "The field is mature and the literature is sophisticated, but DBAE must be packaged convincingly." We must, he said, pay as much attention to the "magic" of which Eisner has spoken as we do to the four disciplines and their boundaries. Enid Haupt extended the question of readiness to the general community. Given budget constraints, she said, "art and music are last on the list." If we want art education taught by art specialists, "we've got to convince our communities that this is a higher priority than, say, reducing classroom sizes."

For roundtable participants, these questions of readiness and receptivity were also tied up with the question of context: Into what environment will DBAE be placed, who will be responsible for its implementation, what will their roles be, and what do they need?

Fred Bacon said that in Philadelphia, teachers seem to be welcoming the additional components of art history and art criticism. But they need reeducation and retraining, he said, because so much more writing is required of them. They need help understanding how to adapt DBAE to widely differing school environments -- for which existing implementation guidelines have been useful, he agreed.

Both Margaret Lewis and Barbara Weinstein spoke of the effect that DBAE has had in creating a more hospitable climate for art education. Support for art instruction is more likely if DBAE is in place, Lewis said, because "it confers upon art the status of a discipline." Added Weinstein, "We're in the process of change needing order. Call it DBAE or whatever, it has given us method and structure and guidelines. We are finally getting the attention of state and district administrators and budget-makers. We're getting across to people who can make things happen." Elaine Weinstone voiced a concern, however: "It's fear of the effects of institutionalization that is inhibiting the institutionalization of DBAE itself."

Throughout the discussion, questions of who should be responsible for teaching DBAE and what roles they need to fill interwove the comments of roundtable participants. Frequently these comments focused on the "generalist-versus-specialist" issue: Is the art specialist indispensable to the implementation of DBAE, desirable but not vital, or merely incidental in the overall process? Bound up in this question, participants suggested, were issues of support, impact, and implementation strategy.

John McLaughlin asserted that while we need to acknowledge that our "end goal" is to have more art specialists, "we mustn't negate other valuable efforts occurring without the use of specialists. Otherwise we risk winding up with nothing at all." Nancy Brookschmitz concurred, saying that "conflicting feelings between itinerant art specialists and classroom

teachers" could be avoided by starting with the generalists, bringing them along, "then moving toward the use of certified specialists with that base of support intact."

Speaking as a classroom teacher, however, Sue Rosenthal said she would welcome having specialists come into her class and add to her instruction when she is teaching history. Likewise, "it would be wonderful if the art teacher, when teaching the seventeenth century technique of underpainting, would talk about what it was like to live in Florence at that time." She respects discipline boundaries, she added, but by providing students with an integrated education we can "give them the tools to cope with the world, to enjoy it, to love it, to understand it."

Not everyone agreed with the suggestion by McLaughlin and others that the teaching of DBAE could be undertaken -- even at the outset -- by generalists. Ed Erdman, who described himself as "a district administrator with a coal-country background," said that general classroom teachers are already overloaded with responsibilities and have too little time. He wouldn't want to proceed with DBAE without art specialists, therefore. Harry Bonelli argued that relying on generalists in the absence of art specialists would be "a bad mistake," and he likened it to accepting medical advice from a layperson simply because a doctor isn't available. "Don't do anything if you don't know what you're doing," he advised. Susan Rodriguez agreed, adding that, in terms of strategy, "if we give generalists the responsibility of implementing DBAE, what does that say to administrators about our claims that we need more specialists?"

Concluding this discussion period, Nancy Brookschmitz suggested that the critical question before the group is "what we are expecting of the art specialist." The expectations include teaching sometimes, guiding generalists in teaching art, conveying the curriculum, providing in-service training for classroom teachers, building the curriculum, and being a supervisor of sorts. "In short, we're asking a lot, and that's both exciting and confounding. It's certainly a difficulty when we're trying to talk about DBAE, and it's something we need to address in both in-service and preservice teacher training."

RECOMMENDATIONS

After separate small-group discussions, participants reported a number of recommendations, including:

On Curriculum Development and Materials

* Many teachers in, or preparing for, art education are trying to write their curricula. Perhaps the Getty Center can help more of them in this process, which could be "an interesting exercise in self-education."

* We need model programs, especially in aesthetics and art criticism, in order to understand what DBAE has to offer and how to integrate the four disciplines.

* We need more "exemplary learning packages" produced in the same style as Beyond Creating and illustrating how to maintain the four discipline boundaries within an integrated approach to art education. "It is very important that NAEA be a strong partner in this effort."

* Ask the Getty Center to function as the "keeper and clearinghouse" of curricular materials so that the "functional body" of DBAE is more readily available on a national level.

* In looking at the in-service education of art specialists, let's focus on curriculum development and methods of teaching DBAE. We need to

"clarify the role of curriculum models as being adaptable to local areas." And at the preservice level, whether with graduate or undergraduate programs, let's provide the help needed with new curriculum development also.

* We must advocate for the availability of good, affordable art reproductions, including reproductions of three-dimensional works.

On Communication and Publicity

* Art education in general, and DBAE in particular, need more effective communication and publicity. We need to use television -- and not just PBS -- to "sell the product," just as Kennedy sold his physical-fitness program in the 1960s. We need to "boil down DBAE" into a clear, brief pamphlet that administrators will read. And we need to develop a comprehensive public information campaign that "builds a body of support" for DBAE.

* More information needs to be directed at arts administrators, arts education training institutions, and existing organizations such as the NAEA and AEA.

* We must support the role of the art specialist as an informational link to parents; more one-to-one meetings between parents and specialists are needed to help explain the goals of DBAE.

- Forums such as this roundtable will always be needed, where art specialists, administrators, principals, classroom teachers, supervisors, and others can come together to talk.

On Funding

- More of our financial resources need to go into our teacher-training institutions and into creating supervisory support for art education in our public schools.

- We need to fund more research for sequential art programs in K-12, with an emphasis on child development. These programs should respect the ethnic and cultural diversity of communities and be modifiable, not rigid models.

Other

- We need more training and experience in lobbying for our own needs, since the Getty Center can't do everything for us.

- The most important thing that the Getty Center could do now is to "espouse the position that the art-trained teacher is the key to the effectiveness of DBAE."

CONCLUSION

In closing, Stephen Dobbs noted that an "open and free exchange" is what the Getty Center seeks and what it believes to be crucial for everyone involved. He stressed that the Center is committed to being responsive to the needs of the field. In particular, he cited these roundtables, other meeting forums, and the work with other national organizations as recognition of the importance of good communication and information.

In response to points made about the need for staff development, the center's preservice work with teacher-training institutions in the wake of the Snowbird Seminar is just the beginning of its activity in this area and will continue.

With regard to partnerships, Dobbs said that collaboration with other organizations is a priority as well, and joint projects with the NAEA, PTA, and others are under way.

Finally, concerning curriculum development, Dobbs stated that the center hopes to stimulate interest in producing DBAE prototype or model lessons and materials, focusing in particular on three audiences for this "catalytic" effort: K-12 art teachers; the teacher-training institutions where new curriculum materials are being developed; and commercial manufacturers "who have the capital to provide choices for all of us when we look for materials to use in our respective programs." In this vein, he

said, the Curriculum Development Institute planned for the summer of 1988 may be the first of several.

Dobbs again thanked those present for their time, interest, and ideas and urged that the "dialogue furthered here today" be continued.

ROUNDTABLE II

Milwaukee, Wisconsin
April 22, 1988

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Leilani Lattin Duke, Director of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, commented on the role of museum education and educators in discipline-based art education. DBAE, she explained, puts the art object at the center of the process of learning about and making art. Frequently, however, the Center works with school districts that are not fortunate enough to have the quality of museum resources that Milwaukee has at its disposal. The Center is therefore seeking to resolve the problem of working with school districts that do not have ready access to art museums. One of the tenets of DBAE is to define art broadly enough to include the entire array of the usual arts -- architecture, environmental art, crafts, photography, painting, sculpture, the graphic arts, and so on. Given this, an important question to be addressed is how to work with communities to tap into resources that might be available other than museums.

Duke then introduced Curtis Carter, director of the Haggerty Museum at Marquette University and host of the roundtable.

Curtis Carter welcomed the participants on behalf of Marquette University and expressed his own pleasure at hosting a discussion on the subject of museum education. The Haggerty Museum, he noted, is relatively young and still in the process of exploring various educational approaches. It has tried to be a resource for educating not only artists or art historians but art consumers by providing programs that stimulate interest in and opportunities for life-long involvement in art.

Carter referred to an exhibition of Tolkien's The Hobbit, featuring drawings from the Oxford University Library and manuscripts from the Marquette University collection. With support from a local law firm, the Haggerty was able to develop an ambitious statewide educational program that included a colloquium of superintendents from many districts; through that network, and with the cooperation of the state's Department of Education and various associations of administrators, information on the exhibition was transmitted across Wisconsin. The museum also organized a seminar for teachers and designed a program to suggest ways to view art in a museum setting and then talk about it in follow-up classroom programs.

Carter noted the positive reception within Wisconsin to the concepts and theories propounded by the Getty Center. State educators had been conceptualizing along similar lines for the past ten years, he said, as they worked out their own programs in arts education. He concluded that he and others are very interested in exploring with the Center the possibilities for extending even further the impact of DBAE in the state of Wisconsin.

Duke then introduced the two panelists for the roundtable: Danielle Rice, curator of education for the Philadelphia Museum of Art, and Lee Devereux, head of public and volunteer activities for the Huntington Library Art Collections in San Marino, California. Duke indicated that the two speakers would approach the subject of museum education from different perspectives. Rice would present an overview and context and then discuss

some provocative issues related to museum education and art education. Devereux would discuss more practical considerations regarding what it means to work with school personnel, teachers, and students who have been through an intensive staff development program on DBAE in the Los Angeles area.

SUMMARY OF ADDRESS BY DANIELLE RICE

In examining the role of the museum as an environment for discipline-based art education, Danielle Rice raised a number of issues related to the wider role of the art museum as a vehicle for the presentation of art and as an educational institution within present-day society. She noted that the benefits of DBAE to museums are fairly obvious, since it demands a greater knowledge and sensitivity on the part of teachers as it simultaneously develops the analytical skills and aesthetic understanding of future museum-goers. However, she suggested that perhaps museums should play an active role in DBAE only in the sense of sharing certain goals, and she raised several related questions, including: What are the implications for using museum collections in this context? Which of the art-related disciplines is best taught in the museum environment? How is the confrontation with original objects in the museum setting different from the use of reproductions in the convenience of the classroom?

Rice examined the relationship between museums and art history, which she described as "a way of ordering objects through time." While most museum curators are trained art historians and thus generally adhere to a chronological framework in the presentation of art, the idiosyncrasies of individual museums can obscure this ordering. Furthermore, she pointed out that a lack of any visible framework often allows museum visitors to wander outside of the "expected progression." While students of art history will choose to view works within the existing schema, artists and art students will tend to experience a museum's collections more randomly. Rice

suggested that a greater emphasis on historical information -- as one aspect of DBAE -- runs the risk of discouraging openness and inquisitiveness on the part of students by channeling knowledge too narrowly. She quoted Joshua Taylor, who, in "The History of Art in Education," said that "there is no such thing as the history of art. There are, rather, histories of various aspects of art." Rice referred to current theories and approaches (such as Marxism, structuralism, and post-Freudian analysis) that reinforce that statement.

Rice also maintained that the information aspect of the history of art -- dates and so on -- should not necessarily be taught within a museum setting, since an emphasis on these kinds of facts detracts from the opportunities students have to experience the art directly and draw their own conclusions from it. This aspect of art history should be taught in schools. Museums are less involved in art history for its own sake than in using it within a larger process of analysis. In other words, it is used to answer the question: "Why do these objects look the way they do?" This kind of analysis, said Rice, allows viewers to differentiate between reactions to the work arising from our contemporary aesthetic and our current fetishism with regard to the object on the one hand and the ideas and goals that informed the making of the work itself on the other.

Along these lines, she referred to Joseph Alsop's The Rare Art Tradition and discussed the notion of preserving and displaying objects and artifacts as one that is itself culture-bound. "It is only in modern, industrialized

civilization patterned on a linear, progressive concept of time that the necessity to preserve the irretrievable past for the sake of the indeterminate future exists at all," she said. Museums with diverse collections that include non-Western art are usually in a better position to define art generally through a "multiplicity of approaches" reinforced by an understanding of different cultures and different periods of history.

Rice briefly discussed the difference between viewing art directly in a museum context and viewing art through reproductions, as is usually done in the classroom. She suggested that the museum setting gives art objects a special significance, an "aura," as Walter Benjamin referred to it in his essay, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." Inflated market values and media hype add to this "aura," and museums tend to contribute to the mystification of art by placing emphasis on their "treasures" or "masterpieces." This, combined with what often appears to be a discouraging attitude on the part of museum staff regarding viewer interaction with the works in their collections, detracts from any direct involvement with the art that might be felt by students.

As a result, much effort should be made by museums and teachers alike to work together in developing preparatory materials and follow-up exercises, so that museum visits can be perceived as one aspect of learning or as experiences that relate to learning in a wider sense. In order to achieve this shared goal, museum educators need to work with teachers to make them feel more secure in analyzing objects themselves and to teach them

effective techniques for involving students in the best way to interact with art within the museum setting.

Rice feels that one of the primary goals of an art museum is to instill in its visitors an increased awareness of and sensitivity to the meaning that can be derived from art objects. As such, the aim of museum educators is to help children learn the skills that are necessary for understanding meaning. These include an expanded vocabulary that will allow them to comprehend and discuss the formal elements of art and communicate the feelings they get when looking at it and the ability to think critically or evaluatively. While these skills parallel those taught through DBAE, Rice asserted that there is a difference in their use in the museum, which, as a setting, is very unlike a classroom and is far from being a neutral context for the viewing of art. Furthermore, museum educators cannot be specialists, since they must constantly be "shifting gears, switching hats, being now an art historian, now a critic or philosopher or artist." At best, museum education is both active and interactive, and the role of museum educators is to serve as mediators between objects and observers.

Rice concluded that museums are best suited to teaching the analytical skills most often associated with aesthetics and art criticism, while reinforcing classroom-learned skills associated with art history and studio practice. The key difference between education in the museum and in the classroom lies in the museum's potential to present art through a holistic process that is not easily subdivided into specific discipline areas. As vehicles for art education, she suggested, museums are not appropriate for

the teaching of any one of the four disciplines per se. Instead, because they emphasize the interaction between objects and their observers in a largely artificial environment, they are able to synthesize the various aspects of DBAE, although by doing so they tend to obscure the distinctions among the four disciplines. "The linear compartmentalization of the world reflected in our educational system is a very incomplete model of reality," Rice asserted. She stressed the importance of encouraging students to understand how things are connected and related in order for them to derive meaning from the world around them. "If art represents the best of human achievement," she concluded, "then surely the teaching of art should strive to no less high-minded a goal."

SUMMARY OF ADDRESS BY LEE DEVEREUX

Lee Devereux contended that museums, as "repositories" of original works of art, should operate in partnership with educational institutions to promote discipline-based art education. As an example of a successful partnership of this sort, she described the accomplishments of the Huntington Library Art Collections and Botanical Gardens, which has been working in conjunction with the Getty Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts for the past five years to promote DBAE in Los Angeles-area public schools. This institute is a pilot staff development and curriculum implementation program for school teams sponsored by the Getty Center.

The key issue is one of communication between museum staff and school teachers and administrators, said Devereux. This kind of communication requires the commitment of museum leadership, since both museum staff and collections must be readily accessible to teachers. A related area of great importance is the development of mutual expectations between teachers and museum educators, as well as shared goals in relation to student learning. At the Huntington, for example, one of the main objectives has been to train teachers to use the collections themselves, so that they will be more inclined to want to introduce their classes to them. The museum staff has worked closely with teachers to make them more comfortable asking questions about the art, finding materials, and using the museum as a regular resource.

Summary of Address by Lee Devereux

As part of her annual talk for the Getty Institute participants, Devereux gives an overview of the Huntington's educational programs. She describes these programs and discusses what teachers can and should expect from museums as well as what museums should be able to expect from teachers in terms of preparation. She challenges the teachers to make the museum aware of their needs and wishes and suggests that, in general, they communicate more emphatically with museums as to what kind of programs are suited to their art curriculum. This "challenge," said Devereux, is a key to empowering teachers so that they can work with museum educators to make museums more effective educational institutions, to develop programs, and to make changes when necessary.

Devereux pointed out that one of the reasons for the success of the Huntington's collaboration with the Getty Institute has been an understanding on the part of both that change takes time. Responsiveness on the part of museum staff and perseverance on the part of teachers is necessary if increased communication is to occur. She then described changes that had occurred at the Huntington as a result of its partnership with the Institute.

One change is that a new program for very young children (kindergarten through fourth grade) has been introduced, resulting both from a greater understanding of how to serve the needs of that age group and from a shift in the museum's own expectations of its role in art education. She noted that, previously, museum staff had felt that younger students weren't able to appreciate what the staff wanted them to learn; the new attitude

demonstrates greater flexibility and sensitivity in teaching different kinds of student groups. The museum has also instituted an outreach program in which slides are available on loan to schools whose classes are not able to make on-site visits. The goal of this program is to spark the interest of students so that they come to the museum on their own.

Another result of the Huntington's collaboration with the Getty Institute is that the museum has developed a team approach to teaching: teachers now share the responsibility for the visits rather than turning their classes over to museum staff or docents. The goal has been to empower teachers by involving them in planning their visits more thoroughly. The museum has also developed special training programs, during which teachers are able to meet with museum curators and other specialists. This enables them to become more familiar with the museum's collections and resources, and to make their particular needs known. Devereux noted, however, that the realities of museum staffing always need to be taken into consideration in planning what each museum can provide for teacher participants.

She concluded by noting that the most positive aspect of the partnership between the Huntington and the Getty Institute has been the development -- though sometimes slow and painful -- of teacher literacy in the museum's collections and other resources. But communication, to be effective, must flow in both directions: while teachers are learning about the museum, museum staff must also acquaint themselves with the principles of DBAE and the needs of both students and teachers. An understanding of audience is

the key to a successful presentation, she said. She stressed that museums must take an active role in working with teachers to develop a more creative and mutually beneficial relationship between the two. The additional resources that a museum can offer to discipline-based art educators to supplement their own resources are tremendously important.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Following the presentations by the two speakers, a general roundtable discussion began, facilitated by Valsin Marmillion, of Ogilvy & Mather Public Relations/West, who described his role as a "conveyor belt," taking on and letting off information from those present. He emphasized that the participants are a microcosm of their field, and what they say will be disseminated widely.

Discussion began with a series of self-introductions, during which each roundtable participant identified the primary enhancing and/or inhibiting factors with regard to the role of the museum educator in DBAE. Having identified these factors, participants then organized the inhibiting factors into four cluster groups: 1) resources, access, and networks; 2) policies and procedures; 3) attitudes, values, and concepts; and 4) training and implementation.

The enhancing factors that follow are listed in the order in which they were introduced, while the inhibiting factors are listed under their cluster headings (a number of them appear more than once). In addition, because the purpose of the roundtable was to focus on problem-solving, the emphasis was on identifying the negative factors, which, for this reason, far outnumber the positive.

FACTORS THAT ENHANCE THE ROLE OF THE MUSEUM EDUCATOR IN DBAE

1) good museum resources for teachers and in-service training with resources
2) sequential curricula
3) cooperation between museum educators and schools
4) adequate school resources
5) direct contact with art objects (as opposed to reproductions)
6) structures for communication and engagement already in place
7) an environment conducive to viewing art objects
8) professionalism of museum staff
9) accessibility to museum staff
10) increased teacher awareness and acceptance of DBAE
11) access for the socially and economically disadvantaged
12) strong docent groups
13) strong community support
15) increased planning for arts as a basic requirement in education
16) "visitor bonding" with the museum
17) variety and flexibility of approaches to art in DBAE
18) development of enthusiasm for the art object itself
19) acceptance on the part of museum staff to educators
20) opportunities for students to break out of negative classroom behavior patterns

FACTORS THAT INHIBIT THE ROLE OF THE MUSEUM EDUCATOR IN DBAE

Resources, Access, Networks

1) lack of staff

2) inadequate financial support

3) scheduling problems and conflicts

4) restrictive field-trip policies (e.g., insurance, transportation)

5) lack of access to or "hands-on" experiences with art objects 6) lack of engagement and concomitant passivity of students

7) time constraints

8) lack of leadership

9) more students than space

10) no strong mechanism for engaging teachers at museums

11) lack of communication between small and large museums

Attitudes, Values, Concepts

1) lack of leadership

2) perceived worthlessness of art education

3) hierarchical management structures and conservative leadership

4) perceived disorderliness of children

5) lack of access to or "hands-on" experiences with art objects

6) lack of engagement and concomitant passivity of students

7) emphasis on test scores

8) elitist attitude of docents and museum staff

9) poor choice of art objects for study

10) intimidating "aura" of museums

11) focus on ideas versus audiences at museums

12) anxiety and discomfort of teachers in dealing with museums

13) resistance to change on the part of museum staff

14) lack of communication between small and large museums

Policies and Procedures

1) anxiety or discomfort of teachers in dealing with museums

2) scheduling problems and conflicts

3) restrictive field-trip policies (e.g., insurance, transportation)

4) hierarchical management structures and conservative leadership

5) lack of access to or "hands-on" experiences with art objects

6) perceived disorderliness of children

7) emphasis on test scores

8) too much to see in too little time

Training and Implementation

1) lack of preparation on the part of teachers

2) resistance to change on the part of museum staff

3) lack of museum literacy skills

4) difficulty of implementing programs

5) inadequate museum staff development

6) limited training of docents

7) no "hands-on" experiences with art objects

8) elitist attitude of docents and museum staff

9) anxiety and discomfort of teachers in dealing with museums

10) no strong mechanism for engaging teachers at museums

11) lack of follow-up

RECOMMENDATIONS

Following the identification of these factors, participants broke into several small groups to discuss various ways in which the inhibiting factors might be resolved or at least neutralized. They then reconvened to report out their ideas and recommendations in plenary session.

The first group to report focused on the factors concerning attitudes, values, and concepts. They developed four recommendations and proposals:

* that dialogue be generated among museums, school administrators, and school boards -- using, for example, evenings in the galleries for the groups to identify and discuss issues

* that museums stress the importance of assessments other than typical student testing programs, urging that basic skills include the arts

* that museums increase interpretive learning experiences, employing videos, discussions, "touchables," demonstrations, and visiting artists

* that museums encourage the use of advisory committees to help recruit a wider spectrum of docents and decrease biases within the museum in all areas of activity; this the group felt to be key to changing current attitudes

The next group also worked with attitudes, values, and concepts and proposed:

- that there be established a highly visible, national-level museum directorship, both to promote DBAE and to advocate museums as learning resources; the members of such a directorship should be composed of the American Association of Museum Directors and should be a part of the American Association of Museums

- that many problems of attitudes and values be resolved by making the museum environment more "audience-driven"

- that the museum commitment to art education needs to be stressed from the top down, especially from boards of trustees, if community values and aims are to be changed

The third group to report dealt with the challenges of resources, access, and networks. All of their recommendations, the group noted, assumed the current level of resources and therefore would not require significantly increased expenditures. They proposed:

- that museum educators help expedite cooperation among museums and between museums and schools

- that there be more staff sharing and that teachers be used in museums as well as schools

* that these cooperative efforts be established through existing organizations

* that limited resources be focused on specific age groups for effectiveness, thereby addressing some of the problems of space, staffing, and time

* that the current expertise of museum staffs be used more broadly and effectively; schools, for example, could benefit both in terms of community support and funding success through the use of museum experts and museum public relations offices

* that multiple-use spaces in museums be used for such things as school programs and demonstrations, and that there be "after-hours" use of museums for educational purposes

Another group, also reporting on resources, access, and networks, focused their recommendations somewhat differently. Their "cornerstone idea" was to emphasize a clear articulation of and dedication to high-quality programs. This, the group argued, would go a long way toward resolving financial problems: given such programs, money should follow. Other recommendations included:

* that extension programs and curricula that are not museum-dependent be developed in areas where there are few or no museum resources

* that pamphlets be used to increase awareness of available resources in different locales

* that teachers be better used as resources, and that there be more preparation sessions prior to museum visits

* that television be treated more imaginatively as an art object as well as a tool to help "turn around" the passivity that it breeds in children

The next report, on issues related to training and implementation, focused on two areas: 1) the preparation of teachers; and 2) museum staff development. Regarding the preparation of teachers, it was recommended:

* that both pre- and post-visit museum materials be developed, as well as resource manuals and study guides

* that there be more after-school workshops

Regarding museum staff development, the general proposal was:

* that docents be trained to think about teachers and students as well as about art and to prepare themselves to better meet the needs of teachers; this might be accomplished with surveys of teachers to discover those needs, university courses and training

manuals for docents, and wider recruitment of museum volunteers from organizations with a specific interest in students, such as the P.T.A.

The last group to report focused on issues pertaining to policies and procedures. This group took as its working assumption that the mission of museums is to educate, which encompasses interpretation, enjoyment, and visual literacy. Their recommendations were designed to answer the policy question of how best to serve these multiple educational needs. The group suggested:

* that policy analyses be initiated within communities, specifically within museums and schools at the board and staff levels, regarding issues such as the scope of art education, access to objects, scheduling, child control, "hands-on" experience, and educational programs for broader audiences. Discussants should then come together and, on the basis of their analyses, 1) coordinate lessons with exhibition programs and 2) develop ongoing dialogues between teachers and museum educators and between curators and school administrators. The logic is that, given the appropriate evaluative structures, all of the pieces for resolving problems will fall into place.

CONCLUSION

At the conclusion of the group reports and recommendations, the facilitator thanked the participants and reviewed the work accomplished. He noted in particular the contribution of the group to the broader goal of heightening awareness of the importance of arts education in society as a whole.

Leilani Lattin Duke also expressed the hope that the published proceedings of the roundtable series would be of assistance not only to the Center but also to museums and schools in their policy planning. She thanked the participants once more for their time, energy, and commitment to helping identify and work through some of the issues pertaining to discipline-based art education.

ROUNDTABLE III

Tulsa, Oklahoma
May 6, 1988

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Stephen Mark Dobbs, Senior Program Officer for the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, welcomed those present and introduced John Everitt, executive director of the Arts and Humanities Council of Tulsa, the host of this roundtable.

After recognizing Harley Manhart, associate director of the Arts and Humanities Council, Everitt explained that part of the work of the Council is to reinforce the K-12 arts and humanities curriculum. The Council has been working with teachers in the Tulsa school system and with artists from across the state and the nation, to help teachers utilize the arts more effectively and to increase the sensitivity of students to the arts and to arts-related issues. The Council sends approximately 150 artists annually into the schools, and through the recently developed Harwelden Institute it trains teams of teachers to incorporate the arts in their instruction.

Everitt closed his remarks with a word of warning and a word of hope: it takes a long time to create effective working partnerships with educators and government officials, he said, but the increased awareness of the arts that results will benefit students at all levels and will contribute to better informed citizens and leaders.

Dobbs then introduced the two speakers of the day: Joseph Goldyne, a San Francisco artist; and Richard Bell, national program director for Young Audiences.

SUMMARY OF ADDRESS BY JOSEPH GOLDYNE

Prior to his discussion of the role of the artist in the classroom, Joseph Goldyne spoke of his perspective on the issue and raised two introductory questions informed by that perspective. As a working artist with no previous involvement in art education, he is both sympathetic to and critical of the advocates of the more traditional creative-expressive approach to teaching art. Goldyne posed two "sensitive" questions: Do those who support the traditional approach do so because of a disability or disinclination to apply the rigor required by DBAE? Are proponents of DBAE aligned with that approach out of a desire to enfranchise their personal disciplines and increase the status of art educators?

Goldyne continued with a brief critique of the idea of art education "beyond creating." Acknowledging his own prejudice about the primacy of the act of creating in art education, he offered "accompanying creativity" as a better stance for an alternative art educational program. Aesthetics, art criticism, and art history -- three of the four DBAE components -- can commence only when there is a work of art. While there is certainly more to be shared with students than just creating, that "more" has its basis in the fundamental creative act.

Moving next to a discussion of the problems facing a revitalized art education such as that proposed by DBAE advocates, Goldyne focused on the present state of the arts curriculum in schools and the training of artists and teachers. DBAE, he said, is a needed attempt at renaissance in art

education, but it faces an uphill battle. It will have to be carried out within the context of a general curriculum that traditionally trivializes art and with a teaching pool that is, overall, poorly trained for a discipline-based approach. The fact is that art education currently does a feeble job inculcating an awareness of the importance and contributions of the arts, and there may not be teachers sufficiently trained to effect the kind of renaissance in art education that is needed.

The root cause of the trivial stature of art in the curriculum, Goldyne argued, is not only the creative-expressive teaching of the arts but rather the stereotypical image of the artist -- the "Bohemian who grunts and paints or sculpts, dies and is resurrected because of tardy appreciation of his gifts." This is to say that the professional product of art education, the artist, is judged to be an undesirable goal by most parents and teachers; one may become an artist at the risk of family unhappiness and personal problems. The situation has been helped somewhat by the collegiate hiring of artists; this, however, has implanted other stereotypes in the minds of educators, based on the contrast between the artist community and the rest of academia.

Here Goldyne turned to discuss precisely who we are bringing into the classroom when we ask the artist to enter; his point was to show some of the critical differences between the artists' world and the worlds of other professions. The professional artist is difficult to evaluate because peer evaluations of artists do not count for much and because there are no particular means of determining what a given artist has to offer. By

contrast, the professional lawyer or doctor can be more easily defined and his performance adequately evaluated. Multiple levels of testing and review make it possible to equate being a lawyer with professional accomplishment. "Accomplishment, however, is not the light that flashes over the declaration: 'I am an artist.'"

Regardless of the immeasurability of the artist, contact and exchange of ideas between artists and children should take place both to help inculcate an understanding of the value of the arts in civilization and to give children exposure to the practitioners of those arts. There is a natural camaraderie between children and artists, Goldyne added, artists being "the closest known adult life form to kids." Limits to the role of artists in education are, however, apparent: artists frequently lack grounding in art-related disciplines, and their native gifts are "rarely poised for communication to children, unless a child can benefit from example alone."

Whenever the artist enters the school, there is present a specialist in doing; this, Goldyne said, is the primary point to be remembered when discussing the role of the artist in education. In turn, "good teaching in the creative-expressive tradition is better than bad teaching within another framework." Goldyne proposed that the artist should educate by doing what he or she is good at doing: if the artist is prepared to explain as well as create, then he or she should be encouraged to do it. The argument here is for a flexible and integrated program, derivative of both DBAE and the best of the creative-expressive tradition; it is an

argument based on a realistic assessment of artists' capabilities and educational needs.

Having discussed in general terms the role of the artist, Goldyne explained what he felt the artist must do to be effective in the classroom. First, the artist as teacher of the young must preserve and nurture a child's sense of magic; in a world dominated by the reality of adversity, the artist can and should employ media that provide surprise and the "magic of adventure." Printmaking, for example, provides opportunities for surprise in its process: the product is always more or less than what the preparer has contributed. Use of such a medium teaches important aesthetic and critical lessons and yields other educational benefits in terms of historical and scientific lessons.

Second, the artist must deal with great ideas, "great visual ideas." These will energize students, not intimidate them, as they teach the diversity of both languages of inspiration and of people. Here Goldyne emphasized the cross-cultural learning that art education can provide and asserted that such an education can give lessons in human relations and the nature of subjectivity. The artist can and should teach not only about the diversity of art but also about the multiplicity of human perspectives.

Finally, Goldyne argued that the artist must teach the child to be prepared for accident, a basic lesson with applicability in all of the humanities and sciences. This means that the artist must teach the process of creating as well as specific techniques in order "to alert the child to the

important suggestive potential of accident or random occurrence." In so doing, the artist opens the child to accept the new and uncalled-for, to view life with an open eye.

In his conclusion, Goldyne briefly developed an interdisciplinary approach to arts education. He argued that while the artist can and must do certain things to have a reason to be in the classroom, he cannot and must not do all of this work alone. Broad participation from teachers in other disciplines is needed if art education is ever to "rest easy." Just as DBAE proponents look to art teachers to broaden their teachings, so aesthetics, the history of art, and criticism should be spliced into the teaching of English, foreign languages, history, math, and science. "Topics relating to life, health, human relations, and politics come up in the humanities and science curricula all the time," Goldyne said, and art must "be given more than a 'walk-on' role in the teaching of these disciplines." His proposal represents a needed complement to the proposals of DBAE advocates, he concluded, and a furthering of their effort to integrate the art disciplines into the core curriculum of this country's schools.

SUMMARY OF ADDRESS BY RICHARD BELL

Richard Bell began his address by making an informal analogy between artists and educators and what he called a "Turkish table dance." The dance, he explained, referring to an experience that he had earlier in his life, consisted of his stepping backward around a table while in conversation with a Turkish man persistently trying to talk at close range. This also describes the way in which artists and educators converse. The purpose of the analogy, Bell said, is to set the context for his remarks, which he hoped would enhance the "dance."

Bell opened with a call for immediate initiatives toward changing the way young people are introduced to and taught the arts. Citing the release five years ago of the national report on education, A Nation at Risk, and the effect that it has had on the perspectives of government, business, and education leaders, the time is right for substantive change.

He then explained the deeper consciousness that has developed regarding art education. Here he cited reports and policy statements that have been issued by a spectrum of various agencies: their overriding theme concerns the need to establish the arts as a basic subject area and discipline in school curricula. Speaking at length about Toward Civilization, the report on arts education recently released by the National Endowment for the Arts, Bell summarized the present state of arts education and the critical issues now facing the field. Quoting from that report, he explained that there is

"a gap between commitment and resources for arts education and the actual practice of arts education in classrooms."

Bell next listed some of the recommendations offered in Toward Civilization, all of which he found timely, most of which he found expressive of the goals of those already working in the field, and some of which he found likely to stimulate significant support. The specific recommendations were:

1) that arts education provide students with a sense of the cultural and creative significance of the arts, and an understanding of the communicative and critical elements in the production of the arts;

2) that education agencies and school districts identify minimum knowledge and skills that would satisfy graduation requirements;

3) that students be tested in the arts and evaluated to determine levels of knowledge and learning;

4) that state certification requirements be broadened and strengthened;

5) that state and local agencies, with federal assistance, develop procedures to evaluate school arts programs; and 6) that the education, arts, and business communities work together to advocate the inclusion of art education as an essential part of any core curriculum.

Having established this context, Bell considered the role of artists in the schools and the role they should play in relation to the reforms that he cited. He began, however, with an explanation of the unequal status of arts education in the educational enterprise: basic literacy in the arts is rarely expected as an outcome of arts education; content and continuity in arts education are frequently sacrificed to the constraints of time and money. The traditional role of the artist, which Bell defined in terms of arts-in-education programs, developed in response to the imbalance between education in the arts and in other subject areas. Arts-in-education programs arose as supplements to regular instruction in the arts; they developed shortly after World War II in the private sector and later, in the mid-sixties, in the public sector.

Arts-in-education programs are carried out by a loosely knit community of individuals and organizations that, although they have few common characteristics, together represent a powerful cross-section of the American business, patron, and political communities. The activities of these organizations are numerous and varied, including performance, workshops, residencies, artists in residence, and teacher training programs. There is no comprehensive summary of services currently offered by artists; however, the proliferation of services provided by arts organizations to school systems is witness to the quality and significance of arts-in-education programs.

It is generally agreed, Bell said, that arts instructional programs and arts-in-education activities have made little progresss in establishing

arts in schooling and the importance of regular instruction in the subject. This is an urgent need. Further exacerbating the lack of effective demonstrations of arts education is the disunity of the arts community. Additionally, a more compelling case needs to be made at all levels for including artists and arts organizations at the center of educational reform. Arts educators must work with artists and the arts community to define clear and rigorous expectations about the role of artists in sequential, discipline-based curricula, and "a comprehensive pattern of collaboration involving groups of organizations" needs to be developed.

If we are "a nation at risk," Bell said, then artists and arts organizations are "a community at sea," filled with ambivalence regarding the need for arts education and lacking specific strategies for strengthening arts-in-education programs. Only six of the more than fifty recommendations set out in Toward Civilization discuss the role of the artist in addressing the issues presented in the report; of these, only one recommendation is anything more than a general statement or afterthought. The absence of specific expectations reinforces the traditional ambivalence of artists about their role in education and fails to show the stake that artists have in the establishment of instructional programs of high quality.

An essential step in changing the status quo is to initiate dialogue among arts leaders in response to specific recommendations about the artists' role in educational reform. Toward Civilization offers a strategic

overview and a detailed agenda for educators. It does not, however, suggest either how artistic sensibilities should inform the goals and objectives of the arts education reform movement or how artists' work as educators might contribute to their artistic growth.

To facilitate the kind of discussion that Bell sees as necessary, he concluded his address with eight "hypothetical recommendations" addressed to the arts community:

1) Arts organizations, both private and public, should adopt explicit policies to make arts education an essential part of their identity. These policies must provide for programs in history and critical analysis as well as performance and production. Provision should be made for staff and support services and materials needed to develop programs. These policies should define "the role each organization will assume in order to help integrate the arts into school curricula."

2) Arts organizations in each community should discuss the following critical issues: a) levels of exposure and training students should receive from outside arts resources; b) the contribution of artists to developing textbooks, training materials, and audio-visual aids; c) how artists should assess the programs provided by outside arts resources and their effectiveness in arts instructional programs; and d) what criteria should be established for certifying artists and arts organizations that work in schools.

3) Arts organizations should consider allocating 15 percent of their budgets to arts education programs.

4) Arts organizations and agencies should be designated as primary or supplementary resources to school systems (based upon levels of income and percentages allocated to educational activities).

5) Arts organizations should develop strategies for evaluating their effectiveness in relationship to the goals and objectives of their school systems' instructional programs.

6) State education agencies, working with state arts agencies, should develop certification criteria for artists and arts organizations who provide school services. Requirements for artists' training should become progressively more rigorous, culminating in the certification of "artist teachers."

7) Artists and arts organizations should begin research projects in support of arts education programs, training, and evaluation. Consideration should be given to: a) defining outcome levels for residency programs; b) creating a balance between production, critical analysis and history in arts-in-education programs; c) creating audio-visual resources; d) making strategies for integrating arts-in-education services with instructional programs; e) defining certifying strategies and criteria for artists and arts organizations; f) surveying arts-in-education programs currently being implemented; g) creating new works designed for young people; h) initiating

long-term studies of the relationships between arts education programs, success in other subject areas, and subsequent involvement in the arts.

8) National arts and arts service organizations should make efforts to orient and educate their constituencies regarding the arts education agenda, with particular emphasis on providing information and strategies to help define the role of artists and arts organizations in educational reform.

Bell ended his address with a few observations about the balance between performance, critical analysis, and historical content in arts-in-education programs. Artists, he said, are prepared to approach their work in schools from each of these perspectives; there is nothing intrinsically lacking in artists' abilities in this regard. This is not to say that artists do not often resist the academic tendency to isolate critical analysis and historical content from their own practice and work, nor that they all have the breadth of perspective favored in other disciplines. But it is precisely this personal viewpoint and idiosyncratic perspective that makes the artist so valuable in the classroom. "The artist can add a unique perspective to the broad, objective truths that are the pedagogic touchstone for most teachers and school administrators."

The arts community must assume leadership in defining the artists' role in educational reform, Bell said. The arts community must not abdicate its responsibility to join in the effort to establish the arts as basic

subjects in school curricula. Arts educators should include artists and arts organizations as essential parts of the educational reform process. Nor should subtextual considerations, including his own specific suggestions, obscure the primary goal of moving the arts into the center of the educational process.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The presentations by Joseph Goldyne and Richard Bell were followed by self-introductions by the participants and their identification of various constraining and enhancing factors in discipline-based art education with regard to the role of artists in the schools. Val Marmillion, the Roundtable facilitator, explained the importance of the participants' work in this process: their thoughts and recommendations would shape the agenda for the day, and the outcome of the meeting would be a collection of their concerns and proposals. He added that the purpose of the roundtable is not to debate the proper definition of DBAE, since, in the opinion of the Getty Center, there is no one "right" definition. Many forms of DBAE will develop. Rather, it is to identify the primary positive and negative factors with respect to using artists effectively in discipline-based art education programs, and then to develop proposals and recommendations for resolving the constraints.

The lists of factors that follow reflect the outcome of this group process. The enhancing factors appear in the order in which they were proposed; the inhibiting factors are organized under four headings that facilitated small-group discussion of how to address these constraints. These headings are: Resources, Understanding and Training on the Part of Artists Going into the Educational System, Understanding and Training on the Part of the Educational Community, and issues of Program Design and Administration. It should be noted that because of the natural overlap among these topics and the general applicability of certain constraints, an inhibiting factor may

appear under more than one heading. In addition, because the purpose of the roundtable was to focus on problem-solving, the emphasis was on identifying the negative factors, which for this reason outnumber the positive.

FACTORS THAT ENHANCE THE ROLE OF ARTISTS IN SCHOOLS WITH DBAE PROGRAMS

1) student exposure to the artistic process and source as well as to historical and critical disciplines
2) the commitment and care of artists with respect to their art form, and their desire to share their concern
3) an emerging consensus among school administrators as to the value of having artists in the schools
4) the ability of artists to bring a broad, alternative perspective into the classroom
5) the teaching of non-linear intellectual and learning processes
6) the intellectual and cultural openness of the artist in his or her teaching and work
7) the ability of artists to personalize and vitalize art, giving evidence that art is not just made by "dead people"
8) community support for programs that bring artists into schools
9) the growing recognition of art as basic on the part of many national educational organizations
10) the clarity and conciseness of issues raised by the DBAE debate
11) the development of increasingly strong artist- and arts-supportive networks
12) the promotion of risk-taking and exploration as part of learning
13) the ability of the artist to teach critical thinking and creative problem-solving
14) increased access to and awareness of the arts on the part of students

15) the natural compatibility of the artist and child, and the artist's affirmation of the child's faith in magic and adventure

16) the high level of productive skills that an artist brings into the classroom environment

17) the ability of the artist to be a catalyst for integrating diverse areas of knowledge and learning

18) the opportunity for children to become active agents in, rather than passive recipients of, learning

19) the fact that familiarity with artists helps students overcome their art anxiety

FACTORS THAT INHIBIT THE ROLE OF ARTISTS IN SCHOOLS WITH DBAE PROGRAMS

Resources

1) the limited availability of artists and arts agencies of quality
2) too much territory to cover in too little time and with too few resources
3) lack of community and media support
4) lack of field activity
5) the uneven qualifications of artists and those who review and select them

Understanding and Training on the Part of Artists

1) the fact that the first priority of the artist is to his or her work, not to education
2) artists' lack of understanding of the educational process or structures
3) lack of communication; too much jargon on the part of artists
4) artists are too production-oriented
5) lack of formal education in criticism, art history, and aesthetics
6) lack of understanding of child growth and development

Understanding and Training on the Part of Educators

1) lack of consensus among art educators and educational agencies as to the best use of artists in schools
2) lack of comprehensive educational planning including the arts or artists

3) lack of sequence and clear objectives in the curriculum

4) lack of communication; too much jargon on the part of educators

5) art anxiety

6) lack of understanding of child growth and development

7) unclear relationships between artists and general classroom teachers

8) lack of higher education support for, or interest in, actively incorporating artists into arts education programs

9) need for more in-service training and workshops

10) perception that artists are "odd"

11) teacher insecurity about competition

Program Design and Administration

1) lack of consensus among artists, art educators, and arts and educational agencies

2) lack of comprehensive educational planning that includes the arts or artists

3) the limited availability of artists and arts agencies of quality

4) lack of sequence and objectives in the curriculum

5) a general conservative trend concerning educational values that may overlook artists

6) in some schools, the use of roving artists as a cheaper alternative to regular art specialists

7) lack of field activity

8) too little time to coordinate activities

9) uneven qualifications of artists and those who review and select them

10) too much territory to cover in too little time and with too few resources

11) failure to see the arts as part of the basic curriculum

12) teacher insecurity about competition

13) failure to involve artists in curriculum development

14) artificial separation between the arts and the rest of the curriculum

RECOMMENDATIONS

After meeting in small groups to consider how the aforementioned inhibiting factors could be resolved, participants reconvened to report on their recommendations.

The group responsible for issues concerned with resources reported first. They proposed:

* that better screening processes be developed in selecting artists and arts agencies with whom to work

* that more emphasis be placed on retaining qualified jurors to review the work of and select artists

* that concrete guidelines be developed for jurors to follow

* that DBAE be defined more precisely in order to help clarify the role of the artist in the classroom

* that grassroots, community-based lobbying and public relations campaigns be conducted on behalf of adequate funding for arts education programs

* that parents, patrons, school administrators, and school board

members be brought into schools in which artists are working, fostering the kind of direct experience that is needed to increase community awareness and support

* that students be given increased exposure to outside arts resources, including more field trips

* that there be an increase in the number of in-school artist studios

* that public relations opportunities for increased public exposure to the work of artists be used to encourage positive perceptions of artists

* that more part-time and full-time coordinators be hired to help staff arts education programs

The second group to report addressed problems relating to understanding and training on the part of artists. The group offered three recommendations:

* that priorities for artists in schools be more clearly defined, which requires the establishment of better orientation programs and workshops at the school level for both artists and teachers; interchange between teachers and artists, with both sides defining their expectations and objectives, would help to resolve the problems relating to artist preparation and awareness of educational needs and would allow for more input of artists' ideas

* that certification programs for artists be strengthened; in no way, however, should artists be substituted for regular art specialists, since the enlargement and enhancement of programs rather than the displacement of one part of a program by another was desired

* that students be given a more significant role in the evaluative process

The group recommending solutions for the problems in understanding and training on the part of the educators first underscored one fundamental point: before we can have new expectations of artists, educational programs must be developed that prepare them to meet those expectations. They then proposed the following:

* that artists of college age be recruited for a special interdisciplinary program of six months to one year in duration, with a goal of discipline-based enhancement of their studio work; artists should be involved both by their own choice and by selection to be professionally prepared to serve as "discipline-enriched" resident artists in the schools

* that model programs be established to train artists to teach in an interdisciplinary manner and to explore alternatives to long-term educational courses of study; such programs could be conducted either through university systems or through private centers

The last group to report offered recommendations aimed at resolving the inhibiting factors in the area of program design and administration:

* that each school district develop, at the local level, school board policies that establish both a philosophical understanding of and a specific financial commitment to arts education programs

* that the allocation of resources flow from these philosophical and financial statements

* that school boards approve a sequential curriculum in all arts areas and hire qualified arts faculty provided with adequate resources to meet the established needs

* that arts agencies develop a clear understanding of their expectations and desired outcomes of the educational systems with which they become involved

* that staff development and training programs be established regarding DBAE; these programs should be sequential and should begin at the college and university level

* that better qualified art historians and aestheticians be hired at all levels

* that arts curricula at the college and university level be expanded beyond their present base in art production

* that efforts be made to promote an increased awareness of the multi-cultural dimension of the arts, and that teacher-training seminars be developed on working with artists to explore this dimension

APPENDIX A

Texts of Addresses

THE ROLES OF THE ART SPECIALIST IN DISCIPLINE-BASED ART EDUCATION

Kellene Champlin
Director of Art Education
Fulton County (Georgia) Board of Education

As I perceive them, the various roles of art specialists are comprehensive and critical. As coordinator of art-education programs for a school system of 40,000 children in 73 schools, with 63 art specialists at all levels, I have definite ideas about art specialists and their unique and important contributions to the total educational plan.

Meeting the educational needs of a pluralistic school population is a real challenge, and fortunately for us, the arts play a rather important part. Later I will describe some specific roles of the art specialist, but in order to establish a context or frame of reference for art education and the art specialist in my school system, I will begin with a few basic questions.

1. Does a child have to learn several ways to manipulate a pencil or crayon or brush prior to making marks with it?

My answer would be no, not to make marks with it. But if we're talking about producing art with it, then there is a large difference between playing with marking tools, and purposefully exploring the potential of a marking tool with the intent of drawing or painting creatively with it.

2. Does a child have to know how and where and when artists have used these tools, in order to make drawings that communicate thoughts, ideas, and feelings?

No, not necessarily, unless our intent is to help children understand more about the content of their art-making in terms of their own culture, and recognize that art is a vehicle of communication in cultures throughout the world.

3. Does a child have to know terms and strategies in order to tell what is good about the artwork they have produced, or about the artwork produced by a classmate, or by Vincent Van Gogh?

No, not really, unless we are concerned with expanding children's perceptual abilities so that they can incorporate more consciously in their own artwork the meanings they intend to convey. We might also be concerned with helping children recognize and understand that there are intents and meanings that Van Gogh wanted to incorporate into his paintings.

4. Lastly, does a child have to think about why artists might have drawn and painted what they did, in order to make drawings and paintings that are pleasing to him or herself?

I would say no, it's not essential in order to make drawings that please. However, talking about and reflecting upon why an artwork pleases or displeases opens up whole new areas of thinking that have to do with philosophy, and more specifically with aesthetics.

If we were merely concerned with "having art class," focusing mainly on making things, then we would not have to worry about all these things. If we are concerned about providing children with an art education, then we do have to worry about all these things.

It is true that a child often experiences much satisfaction in making artworks during the process of acquiring skills and knowledge that enable him or her to produce increasingly sophisticated and more aesthetically satisfying art products. Many classroom teachers, and unfortunately a few art teachers too, might sense some security in the questions I posed, if they didn't have to consider my answers. And, I must hasten to add, I am very much aware of the world of difference between making art and using up art materials. Many classroom teachers, and a few art teachers, too, have been using up art materials for years and calling the outcomes art.

Traditionally, classroom teachers tended to "have art class" while art specialists were supposed to be teaching "art education." I am not suggesting that classroom teachers cannot teach art education. The Getty Center has shown that it can, with resources, materials, and instructional help, teach the four disciplines (art history, art criticism, aesthetics, and production) that together constitute quality content for art education.

On the whole, National Art Education Association (NAEA) members were familiar with and accepting of what the Getty Center refers to as the four "disciplines." NAEA goals have been published; one of them calls for a sequential program of art education that integrates the study of aesthetics, art criticism, art history, and art production as the essential components of quality art education.

I refer throughout this talk to "disciplines" and "components" almost interchangeably, since we're talking about the same four areas of concern. The two major voices for art education in the nation's schools, then, are in synch with what is considered to be the content of art education. As a recent past official of the NAEA, I will say that certified art specialists ought to be teaching art education. As a representative of an association that exists for the benefit and support of art teachers (or "specialists"), this should be no surprise.

The Getty Center also believes that art specialists would deliver more effective art instruction than do classroom teachers. The center piloted the discipline-based art education (DBAE) concept with classroom teachers (one reason being the lack of art specialists), through staff development institutes. I understand that the question the center continues to consider is: Is no art instruction better than competent art instruction by general classroom teachers? "Competent" here implies some intensive preparation for the art instruction that classroom generalists would

deliver. Without the intensive preparation, the question becomes: Is no art instruction better than art instruction by classroom teachers? The obvious answer to most people, and especially to many school administrators, is that art instruction by classroom teachers is better than no art instruction. However, the question is not as simple as it sounds, and that answer is far too superficial.

A few typical examples of "having art" in the classroom include plaster hand prints, colored ditto pictures, popsicle-stick pencil holders, and egg-carton wastebaskets (I could go on). Resources often include the opaque projector for enlarging and tracing around images; a supply of patterns for stereotyped shapes such as cornucopias, Christmas trees, etc.; and "holiday art-craft books," to name just a few. These are the makings of what is called "refrigerator art," or, my personal favorite, "credible take-homes" (Chandler Montgomery).

I am not relating all this to imply that classroom teachers simply cannot teach art education. I know quite personally that many can and do, and some very competently. I am relating it to point out that many classroom teachers are at a real disadvantage in the background they bring to acquiring substantive information about the teaching of art education. Through teacher education programs and through much of our life experience we come to value cooperative skills. Very few of the mental processes involved in the making of art draw upon the cooperative skills we learn so well and value so highly. In creating an art form, whether child or adult, person mediates material. This aspect is rarely a group activity. Most, though not all, classroom teachers simply don't understand this.

For a number of years in the Fulton County schools, I was an adamant defender of the classroom teacher as the pervasive figure in the teaching of art to children, with the help of a few art resource personnel. We taught teachers, and instruction was based on the philosophy that art should be integrated with the general curriculum. Several years later, when I became director of art education for the Fulton County Board of Education, I became responsible for the middle school and high school art education programs, as well as the elementary. With new K-12 responsibility, my philosophy began to change.

We had two art teachers in each of our middle schools, and one or two in each of our high schools, yet at the most formative, critical level, we were leaving art instruction to classroom teachers with the help of a few resource specialists. Parents began questioning this discrepancy as well.

In my experience, while we were helping teachers to differentiate between "having art" and teaching art education, we often felt we were continually losing as much ground as we gained, as teacher turnover persisted. Old habits persisted, as well, and teachers still felt obligated to send "credible take-homes" to parents, and to manufacture cute things to decorate their bulletin boards. We did do some very good things over several years. In fact, there are a few classroom teachers in my school system to whom I would (if I could) award teacher certification in art

education. My favorite type of art teacher to employ is one who has a general education as well as an art education background.

While I still believe today that the classroom teacher has a significant role to play in reinforcing art education, and especially the art-in-curriculum approach, over the last few years we have been proposing art education as a subject, no more and no less important than any other subject to which a child has access in the educational enterprise.

But, with the realization that classroom teachers weren't the answer, we began to focus our efforts on getting art specialists. With the help of parents, the Georgia Department of Education (which by this time specifies minimal art objectives as "basic curriculum content"), the NAEA, the concept of DBAE, and classroom teachers themselves, we are now teaching a sequential, regularly scheduled elementary program for every child in the Fulton County School System. Two years ago, we had seven art resource teachers; currently, we have 33 in 51 elementary schools. In two to three years, our school consolidation plan will be complete, and we will have about 35 specialists in about thirty elementary schools, each with a fully equipped art room. This progress was not a "gift" from the school board.

I would like to describe some of the thinking that underlays our progress, because it has to do with roles and understandings. The few art resource specialists we had became steeped in the NAEA and DBAE philosophical concepts and became quite persuasive about what art education ought to be. The Getty Center's "discipline-based art education" and the NAEA goals provided the basis for the strongest arguments for more art specialists. Two major points were developed from these catalysts, the first of which involved a rationale.

One who does not understand the underpinnings, i.e., the socio-historical background, and the roots of the content of what he or she attempts to teach, may unwittingly undermine the discipline, and can usually accomplish little more than a superficial survey. It is specialists, educated and prepared (and with some measure of talent), who ought to be providing substantive instruction in the disciplines of the visual arts. The reason I state that some talent is requisite to the specialist is in part based on a favorite quote by Victor Lowenfeld: "Those who have never felt what it means to create out of a chaos something meaningful don't know what it means....Those who have never been fascinated by it know it even less."

We argued that few classroom teachers have experienced this, at least not enough to make personal and enduring meaning from it, and their often apparent fascination may be illuminating, but is rarely enduring either.

My second point has to do with a logic problem. A question that is often asked, especially by school-board members, generally goes something like this: "If, as you claim, it is so necessary to have elementary art specialists to teach art, then why isn't it also necessary to have arithmetic specialists, language arts specialists, social studies specialists...?" and so on. This question puzzled me for years, and for

years I really never could come up with a good answer. There was something about the logic of this premise that bothered me.

Some time ago, the elementary math coordinator made the ultimate cliche-type statement to me about an Andrew Wyeth reproduction she had just bought. She said, "I don't know anything about art, but I sure like this." We have all heard this before. It occurred to me to respond with something like, "Why do we never hear someone say, 'I don't know anything about math, but...'" I didn't even know how to end that statement because at that moment it finally rang clear for me that we grow up with math and use it every day. The same is true for language arts, for elementary science, for social studies, for reading and spelling and almost every other thing that goes on in the elementary classroom -- except such things as art, drama, music, and dance. By the time we're adults, we all possess a personal frame of reference for all these things -- except (for most of us) art, drama, music, and dance. What was wrong with the premise was that all along we had been attempting to compare apples and oranges. My tongue-in-cheek watchword became, "Any school subject that the majority of mothers and fathers can't help with at home ought to be taught by specialists." (Not very scholarly, but it worked.)

DBAE and NAEA components provided a philosophical basis, as a new way to look at content, especially through their publications. At times I felt a little guilty utilizing the Getty publications to support the arguments that eventually resulted in art specialists in all of our schools. As I learned more about the Getty Center, I began to realize that maybe what we were doing was really a very positive use of the concept. DBAE was explained to me as a philosophical approach, a broad concept to be realized through many different kinds of programs and many different kinds of curricula. One of the roles of our seven art specialists was as spokespersons for the four-component approach, for discipline-based art education at the elementary level. I perceived the primary role of the art specialist as the best qualified person to understand and deliver quality art education. For the 26 art specialists employed over the last two years, the four disciplines are the basis for curriculum and instruction in art education in our schools. While there was very little convincing to do at the middle and high school levels, there is much work to be done at all levels to attain a better and more effective balance among the disciplines for solid implementation.

Our elementary and middle school art education curriculum guides are recent and based on the four areas of study. We're in the process of completely rewriting our high school curriculum now.

At the elementary level we had vacillated for three years trying to decide whether to develop curriculum for classroom teachers, art specialists, or both. At first we wrote curriculum for classroom teachers and piloted several units. We discovered that by having to explain terms, processes, and descriptions in such detail, the curriculum itself, as a written guide to instruction, would very quickly become voluminous and prescriptive --

two things we wanted to avoid. We finally wrote for art specialists. I see no problem with continuing to educate the classroom generalist in the DBAE concept. From my experience, the more classroom teachers learn about art, the more they understand the need for certified, qualified specialists to do justice to instruction in art education. In addition, I see a great need to educate the art specialist at all levels more thoroughly and comprehensively in the DBAE approach. While specialists may be familiar with the disciplines, it is the integrated approach to thinking about and teaching the disciplines that will make DBAE so valuable to the field in this time of accountability, rigor, achievement orientation, and content emphasis in education nationwide.

I'd like to quickly summarize several aspects of our program that have been impacted by DBAE and NAEA goals. When interviewing prospective applicants for all levels, a major point of judgment on my part is the degree of familiarity with and desire to implement the four components. I simply am not interested in applicants who have no interest in or knowledge about NAEA and DBAE.

It is imperative in art teacher preparation programs to incorporate the four-component concept. I would also support the idea of a more standardized, required course in art education for general teacher education, based on the DBAE concept.

In addition to being spokespersons for DBAE, art specialists need to be able to incorporate the components successfully in their instruction. Specialists at all levels are charged with becoming increasingly accountable for the objectives that are specified for each of the four goal areas (which is how we refer to the four "disciplines").

We are currently designing a monitoring system that will provide for formative and summative evaluation of both the elementary art education curriculum and the instruction. The success of this system will depend largely on the specialists' proficiency in implementing the approach. In addition, art specialists will also be the primary developers of "test banks" for each level. Art education embodies a large and substantive content, much of which is cognitive in nature. It is our contention that those aspects of art content that are able to be tested ought to be, just as in any other subject. We will also be designing other means for making qualitative judgments about the learning of content for which traditional forms of testing are not appropriate.

Through the recognition of real content in art education, our school system now has a related graduation requirement. At present, the requirement is for a year of credit in the fine arts, a foreign language, or computers. As high school art teachers become more confident and proficient in the DBAE approach, especially in foundations and survey-type courses, we will be in a better position to convince the Board of Education to consider an art education requirement, or at least a fine arts requirement without a foreign language or computers tag.

We are already designing some art education courses in preparation for a graduation requirement. Both DBAE and NAEA's sequential, integrated four-component approach are perfectly suited for this type of foundations/survey course. In addition, all of our many studio courses that emphasize art production will also integrate varying degrees of each of the disciplines of art history, art criticism, and aesthetics. Furthermore, we are presently looking for good-quality textbooks for a number of our studio and foundations courses. The textbooks must be designed to complement, supplement, and enhance a four-component, or discipline-based, approach to art education.

Last year my school system initiated a program we call "writing-across-curriculum." We wanted to be as much a part of this program as any other subject. This has been extremely successful and provides students with quality time and support for some really reflective thinking about questions of art criticism and aesthetics.

A better balance among the disciplines is also creating a more fruitful environment in which to explore, through art education, the cultural themes we feel are critical for our students to understand within our multiethnic and culturally diverse school population. Dialogue and sharing kinds of experiences are more likely and freely available when art criticism and aesthetic considerations are as important to the art class as the production of the art work: that is, when talking about art is as compelling as creating it.

The roles of the art specialist in DBAE at all levels are numerous and critical. Specialists must not only accept the premises of the concept, but they must become confident and proficient in its implementation. They are charged with understanding the concept, for translating it into written curriculum, for evaluating the outcomes of their instruction, and of course, for making the approach through their instruction. The DBAE concept, i.e., the four-goal area approach, has permeated art education in our school system. It is a major movement toward rigor, substance, balance, and content, and I have no doubt that it will eventually result in art education as a core area in our school programs at all levels -- where it belongs.

THE ROLES OF THE ART SPECIALIST IN DISCIPLINE-BASED ART EDUCATION

Mary Erickson
Professor of Art Education
Kutztown University, Pennsylvania

I am grateful to the Getty Center for recognizing the ambiguities and confusion that exist regarding the roles of the art specialist in discipline-based art education and convening this regional roundtable to examine the issue. I hope that my talk may shed some light on it. As in any field, there are art specialists who are extraordinarily committed, competent, and successful, and others who are less so. When contrasting the art specialist and the classroom teacher, I shall attempt to avoid contrasting the best-case art specialist with the worst-case classroom teacher. I have too often heard examples of the best classroom teachers compared with examples of the worst art specialists, and I do not want my remarks to be dismissed as biased. I do have a vested interest in advocating that art specialists be employed to instruct students in both elementary and secondary art. I am proud to say that I have been in the business of educating art specialists for many years and have had the privilege of seeing what art specialists are capable of accomplishing, often with minimal support, under what may best be described as arduous circumstances. However, I recognize that circumstances vary tremendously from district to district and region to region, and that what works in one location may not in another. Ultimately, each district committed to discipline-based art education must make its own decisions about what personnel are necessary to achieve successful implementation.

If we want to determine which roles the art specialist can or should play in discipline-based art education, we must understand who an art specialist is. For many reasons, philosophical, historical, and demographic, art specialists in place in the schools cannot be described as having any single set of shared characteristics. A partial list of types of art specialists whom one might encounter includes: The artist-teachers who choose to, and are expected by others to, produce and exhibit their own artwork; the art therapist types who are particularly devoted to addressing the very different needs of individual students; the service-oriented specialists who have made a niche for themselves as sign painters, set decorators, and supply clerks; the traditional, dominantly studio specialists who were trained primarily in art production; and the more recently trained art specialists, many of whom have a much broader training in the four art disciplines as well as a broader approach to art education.

Other layers of complexity must be added to this analysis if we are to come to understand who the art specialist is. The art specialist's role is dramatically different in high school, in junior high or middle school, and in elementary school. At the secondary level, a major distinction lies between the teacher of required art courses and the teacher of elective art courses. At the elementary level, major differences exist among degrees of

direct teaching, versus supervisory, responsibilities. Many elementary art specialists deliver all the art instruction that children receive, usually on a weekly basis. Other art specialists deliver a portion of the art instruction and have the additional responsibility of assisting classroom teachers in delivering other portions of the students' art instruction. Some art specialists serve strictly as art consultants planning lessons and modelling instruction for classroom teachers. Some travel from school to school, contacting each student perhaps only once a month. Some serve only one school building. Some use carts in their travels from classroom to classroom. Some have their own specially designed art rooms. In addition to these many local circumstances, yet another layer of variety in art specialists' roles centers around state curriculum and state teacher-certification requirements.

As we move on to consider the roles of the art specialist, we must recognize that art specialists are many different sorts of persons and that the roles they can play in discipline-based art education must take different forms.

What special roles are demanded for the implementation of discipline-based art education?

Implementing discipline-based art education, much like implementing any other new approach, requires filling certain roles. Following are four roles that must be filled in order for discipline-based art education to be implemented within a district:

1. Art-Content Expert. There must be personnel who hold values and who have skills and knowledge in art criticism, art history, art production, and aesthetics.

2. Art-Curriculum Expert. There must be someone who has an understanding of discipline-based art-education goals, who understands scope and sequence, who has knowledge of children's artistic development in all four art disciplines, and who is competent in curriculum writing.

3. Art-Instruction Expert. There must be expertise available in planning discipline-based art lessons, in devising effective art instructional methods, in motivating student learning in art, in assessing student art learning, and in recommending, adapting, or developing art-instruction resources.

4. Art Administrator. There must be someone who understands discipline-based art education and has the supervisory and management skills to see that a discipline-based curriculum is available for all the students in the district. There must be someone who is able to coordinate art instruction throughout the district. There must be someone capable of effective communication both within the school and within the community. Both school personnel and community members must come to understand how and why art education is changing within the district.

These are just a few of the roles that must be filled for discipline-based art education to work. There are many others, such as someone to adapt instruction to the needs of special learners and various cultural groups.

Are any of these demands special? Do they necessitate the services of an art specialist? Who can fill these essential roles: District administrators? Classroom teachers? Community resource people? Educational consultants? Curriculum writers and their publishers? Or art specialists?

Art-Content-Expert Role

Let us look at the need for art content experts -- that is, persons who have expertise in the four art disciplines. Do we need such experts? There is no geography expert or history expert in the elementary school and each subject area, including art, has its specialized teacher in the high school. Unlike other basic subjects, art is a subject about which the typical teacher knows very little. Mathematics, science, English, and history are required courses not only in elementary school, but also throughout the secondary school. The elementary art instruction received by the average teacher was spotty, delivered by someone without expertise, and almost exclusively project-oriented. Few prospective teachers elected to take art in high school, and if they did, it was probably a studio course. Whereas a district can expect a certain base-level knowledge of many subject areas in all its teachers, that district can expect virtually no expertise in art criticism, art history, or aesthetics, and only very minimal experience, if any, in art production. The community might provide some expertise through museum programs or artists-in-the-schools. Art specialists have a major role to play here. The art specialist's expertise is crucial at the secondary level. Whether the course is a general education one to meet the increasing art graduation requirements in some states or an elective studio or art history course, the role of art-content expert must be met by a trained art specialist. Elementary and secondary art specialists and an art supervisor, if there is one, are the most expert art personnel in the district. In-service art specialists trained in traditional art education approaches may be limited in the range of their understanding of the four disciplines of art. However, they can increase their understanding of weak areas through graduate education, in-service staff development workshops, and professional reading and conference attendance. More recently trained art specialists may be able to assist older specialists in some areas. As art specialists become more broadly trained in the art disciplines, their role as content experts can increase in the school, either directly through teaching or indirectly through assistance and supervision of classroom teachers. If weaknesses in art content expertise exist in a district, a person who has made the life choice of majoring in art and art education at the university level and becoming an art specialist seems the best candidate for staff development. Such a person has a sensitivity and appreciation of art well beyond the average, has a substantial pool of art knowledge and experience upon which to draw, and, above all, is committed to achieving a greater level of art

understanding among students, teachers, administration, and the community. It makes sense that these art specialists be encouraged and supported in order to most efficiently fill the role of art-content experts within a district.

Art-Curriculum-Expert Role

Let us consider the need for an art curriculum specialist in the district. Classroom teachers cannot be expected to develop an art curriculum. When no curriculum exists in a district, a commercial curriculum can be adopted. Art specialists have been responsible for developing the art curricula in many districts. These curricula are often loose frameworks agreed to by all the specialists in the district. They are not always well articulated, balanced, or sequenced. Many specialists, as they become informed about discipline-based art education, claim to already have such instruction in place. Most art specialists are aware of the need for teaching art history, criticism, and aesthetics, as well as production in their classrooms. Many art specialists use art from the past to introduce their production activities. Many also conduct critiques of students' completed works. Various sorts of aesthetic education activities have been developed and adopted in the art classroom through the last twenty years. It is not surprising that specialists who have incorporated such activities claim to be implementing discipline-based art education. Art specialists, already in the field, can play a very significant role in developing discipline-based art curricula. There are some conditions that should be met before this great potential can be tapped, however. Art specialists must inform themselves about the fuller expectations of discipline-based art education. Doing something in all four disciplines may sound like discipline-based art education, but is, of course, inadequate. If art specialists were more fully aware of sequencing, articulation through and across grades, balance among the disciplines, and integration of disciplines without dominance by one discipline, they could play a major role in developing curricula. A discipline-based art curriculum developed by a district's art specialist could exploit local art resources, address the particular needs of students in the community, and take advantage of local expertise.

Several factors work against art specialists effectively fulfilling the art curriculum expert role. Many art specialists work virtually in isolation, especially at the elementary level. David Templeton aptly referred to this situation as one which demanded "triple-A emergency service," the triple-A referring to the "all alone art teacher." When an art specialist teaches 500 to 1000 children a week and travels to perhaps four schools, he or she has no opportunity to cross paths with other art specialists. Even on in-service days, the art specialists are such a small group that they are most often sent along to general sessions with classroom teachers, and have no opportunity to work together on curriculum development, even though the curriculum is often their responsibility. It should not be surprising, in such cases, if the district's art curriculum is a convenient listing of activities that does little to guide art instruction.

Another factor that mitigates against exploiting in-service art specialists in discipline-based curriculum development is the history of art education. In-service specialists were trained largely in studio production and earlier approaches to art education. They have a core knowledge of art history and minimal, if any, training in art criticism or aesthetics. If in-service art specialists are to contribute to discipline-based curriculum development, they will need training in the art disciplines with which they are inexperienced. University art education consultants and state department of education personnel can assist in-service art specialists in satisfying their district's curriculum needs. As preservice art education changes, the curriculum development role of the art specialist should change. As prospective art specialists are introduced to the commercially available curricula, as they develop values and inquiry skills and acquire knowledge in all four art disciplines, and as they study the components of a discipline-based approach to curriculum, the role of the art specialist in curriculum should increase dramatically.

Art-Instruction-Expert Role

Let us consider the need for an art instruction expert within a district, that is, someone who is skilled in planning art lessons, generating art activities, motivating art learning, developing art instructional resources, and evaluating art learning. Since discipline-based art education requires instruction in content not traditionally taught, there is an increased demand for the generation of particular lesson plans, motivation techniques, and activities aimed at teaching the new content. New resources are also needed to support the new instruction. And new evaluation techniques are required to assess whether the new content has been learned. There are a number of alternatives to fulfill these instructional roles. If a commercial curriculum is purchased, this curriculum may well contain a teacher's guide outlining lessons, activities, motivation, and evaluation techniques. It may also provide or list all resources required to teach the content specified. If there are no art specialists in the district, the selection of a commercial curriculum and its recommended resources may be a reasonable choice in minimally fulfilling the district's art-instruction needs. Classroom teachers are no more prepared to fill art-instruction roles than they are to develop the curriculum itself. Where art specialists are in place, they can adopt instructional methods and resources outlined in a commercial curriculum, adapt these methods and resources to the district's particular needs, or invent their own instructional methods for teaching whatever discipline-based curriculum the district has adopted. In districts that have committed themselves to art specialists at the elementary level, the same options exist. At whatever level, evaluation in nonproduction art disciplines is an area with which art specialists have little experience and may benefit from the assistance of an art education consultant.

Art specialists have considerable experience that is useful in developing art instruction methods and resources. University studio classes have developed in many art specialists important instructional skills, like

generating a variety of solutions to a problem, working independently, imagining alternative directions, making individual choices and following through on those choices, integrating many variables, and evaluating the success of choices made. As art specialists conduct their production classes, their students are taught these same skills. Effective art specialists assist students in developing curiosity, fluency, a capacity to experiment, the courage to take risks, and the independence necessary to bring an original idea to completion. As specialists increase their capacities to develop these skills and attitudes in their students, they hone and refine their own capacities and commitment. Good undergraduate instruction in any field should, arguably, develop all these skills and values. it is, however, virtually impossible to avoid repeated experiences that exercise these skills and reinforce these attitudes in studio art classes and in the everyday professional experience of the art specialist. These skills and attitudes are as important to effective teaching in art criticism, art history, and aesthetics as they are to art production. More so than most teachers, art specialists are experienced in inventing lessons, activities, and resources, since historically there has been little choice but to do so.

Even though in-service art specialists have not been trained in art criticism, art history, and aesthetics instructional methods, they have considerable experience that should not be ignored. Most art specialists prize the active learning that is characteristic of the art classroom as well as the diversity of directions pursued and the individual achievements of their students. Commitment to active learning, diversity, and individuality has caused some art specialists to be anxious about moving toward a discipline-based approach to art education. If art specialists were encouraged to transfer their traditional art-classroom values to a broader range of art content, exciting new instructional methods and resources would emerge. As preservice art specialists are provided with a discipline-based approach, they should be able to marry traditional art specialists' instructional skills with the new challenges of discipline-based art instruction. Training in art history, art criticism, and aesthetics, as well as studio courses, should result in specialists committed to developing instructional methods and resources to teach students to appreciate cultural diversity as well as cultural continuity, to have the courage to propose and support interpretive and evaluative conclusions, to be reflective, and to value fluency, clarity, and sound reasoning. The challenge for university art educators as well as art specialists is to maintain traditional art skills and attitudes while broadening and deepening art understanding.

A discipline-based art curriculum cannot teach itself. It must be taught by teachers skilled in art instruction. Surely it makes sense to make a commitment to the staff development of in-place art specialists who already have considerable art instructional skill. Effective in-service staff development of all in-service classroom teachers across the country is almost unimaginable. In-service staff development for all art specialists is much more conceivable. Evidence of already on-going, national recognition of the need for art specialists to broaden their skills is

already evident in the greatly increasing attention to discipline-based art education in professional journals and at professional conferences. Five of the categories of conference proposals to be presented at the 1988 National Art Education Association conference are indisputably discipline-based. When art instructional expertise is available in the form of in-place art specialists, it makes sense that those specialists should play the role of art-instruction experts.

Art-Administrator Role

Various persons might fill the role of art administrator for a district. If a commercial curriculum has been adopted at the elementary level, building principals may be able to supervise its implementation, adding yet another responsibility to the many already delegated to the building principal. At the secondary level, art specialists are often charged with full responsibility for managing the art program. If there are several specialists, they are often organized into departments with formal department heads, or informal art coordinators. Some districts have an art supervisor, arts supervisor, special supervisor, or other district-level administrator who is responsible for the administration of the art program from kindergarten through twelfth grade. Where art specialists are in place, coordination should be rather easily managed. The relatively small number of specialists in a district should be able to be brought together for communication, coordination, staff development, curriculum development, and exchange of effective instructional methods much more easily than all the classroom teachers in the district can be brought together. Unfortunately, such coordination is too seldom found to exist. Administrative support must be available from the central office level to the building principal level in order to effectively implement any curriculum change. Meeting times must be arranged, priorities established, and specialists' time made available for meetings. Such coordination is an administrative role that individual art specialists cannot fill.

Art specialists are often in the predicament of worrying about whether their positions might be cut. This fact and others have made them increasingly interested in arts advocacy in their schools and in the community. Some art specialists have had extraordinary successes in gaining school-district and community support; others have not. Milbrey McLaughlin's 1984 study of successful art programs across the country suggests that persons in a variety of positions have spearheaded successful programs. The art specialist can play a role in advocating discipline-based art education in a district, but needs administrative support to do so. The community may be used to support certain values in its district's art program, such as art-contest winners and extensive district art shows and festivals. The wider range of values of a discipline-based art education may need to be presented and explained to interested members of the community.

Whoever fills the art administration role in the district can be greatly aided by the attention brought to art education by the Getty Center for

Education in the Arts. Its publications, Beyond Creating (1985) and Discipline-Based Art Education: What Forms Will It Take? (1987), have brought the attention of national educational leaders to issues in art education. The May 1987 issue of the Journal of Aesthetic Education, with its Getty-commissioned papers, provides art administrators with scholarly support for a discipline-based approach to art education. Possible support of discipline-based art education articles in the widely read classroom teacher's magazine, Instructor, would assist classroom teachers and art specialists alike by proposing activities, providing resources, and increasing the visibility of discipline-based art education among school personnel. Supporting the inclusion of art reproductions with suggested activities in Art Education may overcome the reluctance of some art specialists who are concerned about the practicality of discipline-based art education while it builds a pool of resources for those specialists who are ready to attempt a discipline-based approach. The Getty-supported regional institute project, now under way, should provide several examples of discipline-based art education that districts can look to for alternative models that can guide their decision-making processes.

I have tried to show that crucial roles in discipline-based art education can be effectively and efficiently filled by art specialists. Those roles include the art-content expert, the art-curriculum expert, the art-instruction expert, and, perhaps to a somewhat lesser degree, the art administrator. Individual districts in different states across the nation must make their own decisions about how they will fill the roles essential to successful discipline-based art implementation. As these decisions are made, I urge districts to consider the potential contributions that experienced in-service art specialists and newly trained, more broadly based art specialists have to offer. The Los Angeles discipline-based art education research and development project funded by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts has shown us what selected classroom teachers can accomplish when trained in basic discipline-based art education theory and methods. Given a similar effort in staff development and district wide support, just imagine what art specialists might accomplish.

THE ROLE OF THE MUSEUM IN DISCIPLINE-BASED ART EDUCATION

Danielle Rice
Philadelphia Museum of Art

Art museums typically attract artists, art historians, and critics, as well as casual viewers. And there is an unquestioned understanding among museum professionals that the most important aspect of any museum visit is a meaningful aesthetic experience. Thus museums are arguably ideal places for discipline-based art education. There is certainly little question that the renewed emphasis on art history, aesthetics, and criticism in the classroom encouraged by discipline-based art education bodes well for the art museum. It promises to have more teachers turning to the resources of the art museum as they try to adapt to the new challenges of teaching discipline-based art education. It also promises to equip generations of children with the looking and analytical skills essential to an enhanced museum experience.

But how good is the art museum for discipline-based art education, and what are the implications of using museum collections in this context? Which, if any, of the art-related disciplines is best taught in the museum environment? How is the confrontation with original objects in the museum setting different from the use of reproductions in the convenience of the classroom? In other words, is it worth all the effort of getting the money for the buses, the permission slips, the substitute teachers and parent chaperons, bundling the children up in inclement weather and sending them off to the art museum? I shall reflect on some of these questions as I examine the museum as an environment for art and the goals of art museum education. My assumption is that museums and discipline-based art education can be mutually supportive and effective only insofar as they have parallel missions.

I'll begin by considering the relationship between museums and the history of art. Art history is, among other things, a classification system, a way of ordering objects through time. Most museum curators and a large portion of museum educators are art historians by training. Art museums are roughly organized along lines determined by the history of art -- that is to say, a chronological framework based on stylistic development and historical periods structures the way museum collections are disposed throughout the building. Divisions between schools and countries established by the history of art are often closely followed in the museum. For example, museums seldom put northern European Renaissance art in the same rooms as Italian Renaissance art if their collections are large enough to allow for separate galleries, and I have never seen Chinese art of the Ming dynasty exhibited in its chronological order with Italian Baroque art. Rarely does one find American 18th century art exhibited with European art of the same period, and so on. Assumptions about what is good or great in art, rooted in the discipline of art history, also help shape what museums collect and how they exhibit it. For example, the recent trend in

revisionist art history of the 19th century has resulted in more works by Academic painters, considered junk in the 1950s, to be shown in today's galleries.[1] But in general, objects considered to be great masterpieces are very carefully installed along good vistas with dramatic lighting, while objects of secondary importance are often more densely hung. It is a common practice at many museums to put lesser paintings within the context of decorative arts or period rooms.

While museums generally adhere to art historical principles, the idiosyncrasies of each individual museum, caused by factors as diverse as architectural limitations, special collections, lacunae, and so forth, often obscure the ideal historical ordering. In addition, the visitor is free to pick and choose where he or she goes in the museum setting, sometimes traversing art historical spans and sidestepping the expected progression. I have argued elsewhere that this lack of visible structure in the museum actually makes it hard for many casual visitors to enjoy open-ended browsing in permanent collections.[2] They prefer the more structured environment of special exhibitions.

There are a number of ways in which visitors who have a background in art history, or are art historians by training, use the museum. Some come expressly for the purpose of studying a given work or artist, and others come just to explore the collection. But all people with training in art history have this in common: they have internalized a schema that helps them to shape and order the museum visit. For art historians, the schema is composed of the progression of styles and the information about artists and art events -- in other words, the taxonomy or classification system that is art history. The visit to the museum expands and enriches this system. For example, seeing more paintings by a certain artist or of a given period enhances and improves the existing understanding of personal or period style. Beginning art history students often feel euphoric by their new-found power to make sense of museum objects. They like to impress their friends by guessing the authors of certain works without reading the labels. When this happens, these students are showing off the information that they've internalized -- the large number of slides and reproductions that they've memorized in order to recognize stylistic characteristics.

In contrast to art historians, artists and art students have been trained to use their eyes to detect subtleties of composition and design. This kind of training also provides a schema for viewing, but one that differs from that used by art historians. Artists often experience the museum collections more randomly -- less bound by the conventions of art history -- looking for inspiration and ideas for their own work.

Because existing schema help shape a museum visitor's perceptions, it is reasonable to expect that discipline-based art education will play an important role in preparing students to approach the art in the museum.

An integrated approach to art involving analysis, historical information, and studio practice will ideally prepare the students to have more

meaningful interaction with the art objects in the museum setting. But there are some dangers. The beginning art history student who looks at art only in order to pigeonhole it according to style or school is not leaving himself or herself open to a full aesthetic experience. Children who are testing their newly acquired knowledge of art history may fall into a similar trap of using the art primarily to illustrate or reinforce certain learned facts or theories.

The methodological problems within each discipline may further complicate matters. Joshua Taylor once said that "there is no such thing as the history of art. There are, rather, histories of various aspects of art." [3] The recent debates in the discipline of art history between Marxism, structuralism, post-Freudian analysis, deconstructionism, and the more traditional connoisseurship and iconographical approaches reinforce this statement.[4] In an article on "Teaching Art History as an Inquiry Process," Mary Erickson provides a comprehensive model for a way in which the complexity of art historical methods can be responsibly analyzed into a series of specific skills, by focusing "...not only on what art historians conclude, but also on how they reach those conclusions." She divides the process of art historical inquiry into three categories: skills for establishing facts (including restoration, description, and attribution), skills for interpreting meaning, and skills for explaining change.[5]

Museum people -- curators, conservators, educators -- use a variety of these skills. Curators develop their eye and concentrate on the connoisseurship of art, but for research in special exhibitions they often use a very different set of skills. They need to be aware of changing market values and to be effective detectives in tracking down provenance (the original line of ownership of an object) and in identifying related objects. Conservators work with curators to try to determine the original effect of an object and to make informed judgments about its condition and method of restoration. Educators need to mediate between people with little or no background in art and original art works. They can seldom invoke the history of stylistic development and have to concentrate more on interpreting the object. But to do so, they have to be up to date on the latest art historical interpretive methods and information about a given period, style, or artist.

For me, the problem of teaching from original objects is in fact a complex and deeply philosophical one. I became a museum educator in theory as well as in practice when, during an internship at the Toledo Museum in Ohio, I discovered that all of the art historical information I had absorbed as an undergraduate major was not adequate to answering the question of a ten-year-old child about the meaning of a specific object. I could not call on issues of influence or the range of images that I had memorized to show how this object fit into the history of art. To answer the child's question, I had to listen carefully to his reactions in order to discover ways of connecting them to effects in the painting and decisions made by the artist. I had to draw on my knowledge of psychology as well as my skills as an artist.

In my experience, the information aspect of the history of art --the facts and dates about specific artists or art works -- are very poorly taught in the museum setting. Giving children facts takes time away from their opportunity to look at art and draw their own conclusions. On the other hand, exposure to different styles and periods is helpful in giving them a sense of the stylistic progressions that structure the history of art and organize museum collections. This is a subject that is best taught in school. I found, also, that the more I knew about an object and its historical context, the more adept I became in framing questions and developing exercises to help children look. Thus the knowledge of art history can inform and enrich the museum experience.

In the museum, history is not learned for its own sake. Instead, it is used to answer a very important question: Why do these objects look the way they do? The history of art is thus subordinate to the process of analysis. Conjectures, based on research about an artist's intentions or a certain culture's patterns, allow us to differentiate between reactions grounded in our contemporary attitudes and ideas and concepts that may have shaped the world view of past artists.

If art history is a discipline that can, at best, be reinforced in the museum but not taught in its entirety, what exactly is to be gained from looking at original objects instead of reproductions? Reproductions are infinitely more accessible to children, and as technology improves so will the quality of the images. Furthermore, there are some real pitfalls to indoctrinating children about art in the museum setting. All too often negative experiences with the restrictions imposed by museum authorities ("don't run," "don't talk too loud," "don't touch") can really sour even the best educational intentions. I am perhaps overly sensitive to the implications of placing too much emphasis on the value of the original and its equally sacred setting, the museum.

In his book entitled The Rare Art Traditions, journalist Joseph Alsop sets out to prove that museums, art history, and art criticism are actually secondary elements -- "by-products," as he calls them -- of a system that has at its core not the making but rather the collecting of art.[6] He examines at length the singularity of the few cultures that have had "rare art traditions," that is, where art was primarily viewed as something to be collected and admired. There is a kind of fetishism implied in the way our consumer-oriented culture deals with art that I find myself recoiling from. I certainly would not want to be responsible for passing it on to children.

While there is much that is controversial in Alsop's argument, it is also quite true, as he points out, that museums, along with the disciplines of art history, aesthetics, and art criticism, are very recent phenomena and by no means universal ones. They are the products of the intellectual, political, and economic revolutions that took place in Europe at the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century. Many of the art objects now housed in museums were produced for diverse purposes by cultures for whom the concepts of art or art museums did not exist. The very notion of preserving old artifacts is itself culture-bound. For

agrarian societies with a cyclical notion of time, the need to keep something indefinitely did not exist. It is only in modern, industrialized civilization patterned on a linear, progressive concept of time that the necessity to preserve the irretrievable past for the sake of the indeterminate future exists at all.

The multiplicity of approaches to art in different cultures is an especially important point to integrate in the teaching of discipline-based art education and art appreciation in general. Museums with diverse collections including non-Western art are usually in a better position to reinforce this point. And, in establishing arts curricula, we should not forget to cast the net as widely as possible in defining art.

Given the history of art history and museums, the object within the museum setting takes on a very special meaning. The original object has what the German critic Walter Benjamin called "aura," when he discussed the status of the work of art in an age of mechanical reproduction.[7] Visitors to the Louvre go to pay tribute to the Mona Lisa as if to a specially endowed religious relic. They are enjoying the experience of the authentic, the real thing, the original that belongs to all those reproductions. They are well aware that the financial value of such original objects is way beyond anything that they can afford. The media hype around the inflated market values of paintings by Van Gogh and others implies that art is expensive and inaccessible. Museums often contribute to the mystification inadvertently by placing the emphasis in their exhibitions on "masterpieces" or "treasures." Even dramatic installations can imply that a worshipful distance should be maintained between the viewer and these valuable possessions. All these subtle factors, combined with the less subtle but infinitely more threatening museum guards yelling "Don't touch!," can contribute to making children feel awed by and ultimately detached from the objects in the museum and from their own creative abilities. While it is inevitable that students studying art through reproductions will have established closer relationships with the objects that they've experienced, it is important not to let the museum experience stop at just merely seeing the original of the reproductions. And it is essential that the visit to the museum not become merely a ritual worship of valuable, inaccessible treasures.

In understanding how discipline-based art education can best work in the museum setting, we should consider the goals of museum education. These are fairly simply stated: museum educators work to help children learn the skills that are necessary to derive meaning from original objects. These skills include the increased awareness that comes from directed observation, an expanded vocabulary adequate to talking about the formal elements of art and effective in communicating the feelings that one gets when looking at objects, and the ability to think critically or evaluatively about art. While these skills parallel quite well the skills taught through discipline-based art education, there is a difference in their use in the museum. First, the emphasis is on deriving meaning, not on learning the particular language or vocabulary of a given discipline. Second, as I have tried to show, the museum itself, as a setting, is far

from being a neutral context for the viewing of art. It is often an awesome environment that attracts children's attention and demands consideration.

Museum educators have known for a long time that museum education is most effective when museum visits are regular, more frequent than once a year, and connected to classroom activities. The one-shot museum visit, most often regarded as a field trip, even if it is an excellent experience, is at best a marginal adventure that the children do not really associate with education. Museum cafeterias, fountains, elevators, and nasty guards often leave much stronger impressions with one-time visitors than the content of even the best planned museum lesson.

Many museum educators have tried to develop materials that teachers can use to prepare their children for the museum visit as well as post-visit tests and follow-up exercises. Some of our most successful school programs at the Philadelphia Museum are multi-visit programs where the museum becomes a familiar, alternative classroom to the children, and the themes of the visits are linked to subjects that they study in school. I can easily envision multi-visit programs created around the concerns of discipline-based art education for each grade level.

Museum educators, as teachers, can play a very important role (perhaps their most important one) in discipline-based art education by helping classroom teachers who may feel insecure in analyzing objects. Museum educators are masters at facilitating class discussion about art. Given the constraints of the museum environment -- where we can't make art and can't mess up the galleries -- museum educators have developed highly effective techniques for involving students in the act of looking. But they must do so as equal partners. Too often teachers come to the museum with unrealistic expectations, i.e., in forty-five minutes or less, expose the children to the history of world art. They place constraints on the visit that limit the possibilities of what can be accomplished, for example, demanding that children see certain works of art that may be unrelated to the museum lesson and scattered throughout the museum. With the development of a set curriculum for discipline-based art education, there is an added danger that the museum visit will become more functional than fun and lose some of the excitement that it can ideally convey.

In conclusion, the museum is, in my opinion, best suited to teaching the analytical skills most often associated with aesthetics and art criticism, and reinforcing classroom learned skills associated with studio practice and art history. But there is a key difference between the museum and the classroom: in the museum setting, the emphasis is on deriving meaning. This is a holistic process rather than one easily subdivided into specific discipline areas. Museum educators are constantly shifting gears, switching hats, being now an art historian, now a critic or philosopher or artist. They do this in order to respond actively to the perceptions, questions, and issues raised by their young audiences. Museum education, at its best, is active and interactive, and master museum educators have an excellent knack for mediating between objects and observers.

I would almost go so far as to say that the museum may not be a good teacher of any of the disciplines per se. Children may find it quite difficult to choose which of their four discipline hats they should wear when visiting the museum, because museums require that they wear all four at once. By placing the emphasis on the interaction between people and objects in a largely artificial environment that is not easy to ignore, museums pull together the separate threads of discipline-based art education. In doing so, they may obscure the neat boundaries between these artificial constructs and perhaps risk confusing children trained in this process. But it is important to remember that people experience the world all at once. The linear compartmentalization of the world reflected in our educational system is a very incomplete model of reality. To encourage our students to become deep thinkers, artists, poets, and leaders, we have to give them a sense of how things are connected and related. Traditionally, art has been considered important because it exemplifies the depth and complexity of the interrelationship between human beings and their environment. If art represents the best of human achievement, then surely the teaching of art should strive to no less high-minded a goal.

Notes

1. Grace Glueck, "Clashing Views Reshape Art History," New York Times, Arts and Leisure Section, Sunday, Dec. 20, 1987.

2. See my paper, "Artful Seducers: Museum Exhibitions and Public Experience," presented at the January 1988 meeting of the Association of Art Museum Directors, to appear in the Museum Studies Journal, Fall 1988.

3. Joshua Taylor, "The History of Art in Education," in E. Mattil, ed. A Seminar in Art Education for Research and Curriculum Development (University Park, Penn.: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1966) p. 46.

4. See my paper, "The Uses and Abuses of Art History," in Collected Papers, Pennsylvania's Symposium II on Art Education and Art History, published by the Office of Basic Education, Pennsylvania Department of Education, Harrisburg, PA, 1986.

5. Mary Erickson, "Teaching Art History as an Inquiry Process," Art Education, 1983, 36(5), 28-31.

6. Joseph Alsop, The Rare Art Traditions (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1982).

7. Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," Illuminations, edited by Hannah Arendt (New York: Schocken Books, 1969).

THE ROLES OF THE MUSEUM EDUCATOR IN DISCIPLINE-BASED ART EDUCATION

Lee Devereux
Huntington Library Art Collections and Botanical Gardens

A museum, as a repository of culture, a place where works of art can be seen and responded to and where one can learn to understand the place of art in culture and history, should be in partnership with discipline-based art education. As my contribution to this panel, I would like to share what the Huntington has been doing in partnership with the Getty Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts -- the discipline-based art education program in the Los Angeles area.

A fundamental issue among educators in museums has always been the communication between museum educators, schoolteachers, and administrators about their mutual objectives and the quality of the experience they can plan together for school children. The Huntington has been struggling to make teachers more aware and comfortable with our collections for a long time. An example of that effort was a course we offered ten years ago for credit through California State University at Los Angeles, at a charge of only six dollars. The heads of our divisions taught the class, which was offered on six Saturday mornings for two hours. Our objective was to train teachers in how to use our collections on their own, with the hope that they would then introduce their students to them. Like many of the museums in the Los Angeles area, we have waiting lists of schools who want to use our programs. We felt that if we could train teachers, then they could bring their classes in themselves and be able to deal with the collections as they wanted to within their own curriculums. The first year, twenty teachers signed up and completed the training; the second year we had eleven, and the third year we had six. It was clear that we were not meeting our objective when the teachers, who were taught by our staff, still wanted staff or docent tours when planning their visits to the Huntington. Clearly these teachers still felt unprepared or uncomfortable, even after taking the training.

So, with an understanding gained from experience that teachers needed to know more than we had originally been prepared to teach them, it seemed natural to work with the Getty Institute and to be a site for their discipline-based art education program.

One of the benefits of our work with the Getty Institute has been that we have learned a lot more about how to make teachers comfortable with our collections. I don't necessarily mean comfortable with knowledge in an art historical sense. I mean that the teachers need to know that the museum will welcome them, that they can ask questions, find materials, and even make mistakes without undue criticism because of their lack of knowledge about art. By comfortable I also mean that the local museum should be a regular resource for teachers, who can visit often and know how to use the collections -- one of the basic objectives of all museum educators.

It was clearly within our purpose to work with the Getty Institute, and so we readily agreed to do so when they approached us as a possible site for their faculty lectures. We also agreed to provide art history lectures, given by our own staff for the participants, as well as to make our galleries available for use by the staff of the Getty Institute. We have always known that the teacher is the key to any good museum education program that deals with the schools; this knowledge comes from our experience of more than twenty-eight years of working with teachers and schools within our Huntington Art Gallery tour program for sixth-grade students.

Because of our work with the Getty Institute, we have learned much more about what teachers need to have to be comfortable with our art collections. The Getty Institute and discipline-based art education have not only been introducing teachers to museums but have also prepared a great number of teachers to use museums on their own. And this partnership has been a necessary one, I believe, since museums house the original works of art, or the original sources, and, as such, should be a vital component of discipline-based art education.

There must be a commitment from the leadership of the museum for both access to the museum's art collections and to the staff. Staff can also mean volunteer staff, since many museums do not have adequate paid staff members and must rely on well-trained volunteers to supplement their departments. Staff must then work with the number of requests for programming and try to give special attention to as many as possible.

Each year, as part of my talk on education for the Getty Institute participants, I have been asked to give an overview of our educational programs for the schools. My outline follows this format: a welcome and description of what the Huntington is all about; a listing of our current school programs with a brief description of each one; a general focus on what teachers <u>should</u> expect from museums as well as what they <u>can</u> expect from them; and what should and will differ from museum to museum, since teachers need to know that differences abound within the museum field not only with types of collections, but in philosophy, use of space, finances, and staff.

After I describe our programs, I cover a topic often discussed at museum educators' meetings -- that is, what museums would like to be able to expect from teachers. Sometimes obvious expectations should be pointed out, since doing so will lead to better communication with teachers and schools. All museum educators are constantly surprised at the lack of preparation on the part of teachers when visiting their institutions. We are finding that teachers are now asking questions of the Huntington that they would not have attempted to ask without this introduction and overview discussion. For instance, questions such as "Can I bring my first-grade students for a look at <u>Blue Boy</u>?" are no longer asked. Most museums have school program brochures explaining their programs, and teachers have been told what is offered. After attending the Getty Institute, teachers know that they have the right to ask for what they want. These teachers are

becoming knowledgeable about what to ask for when they call the museum. This can, of course, be viewed in both a positive and a negative light: for some museums, it may be too much trouble, because of the extra time it takes to plan a special visit with a teacher. This is why teachers should be encouraged to continue, persevere, and find the museums and staff that will work with them.

In the Huntington presentation to the participants, I challenge the teachers to ask the museum for what they want. I tell them that museums need to know what fits into their art curriculum and their lessons. With this information, a museum staff person can work to make changes if the existing program does not meet the needs of the teachers' curricula. This challenge is just another key to empowering teachers, so that changes can be made within museum education. Clearly the ideal is joint planning to make any necessary changes. An educator can go to the leadership of the museum if enough teachers ask for something. Without requests, needs remain unmet. I hope that these same teachers who attended such sessions are asking questions of other museums. Additionally, at the start of any work with museums, it is important to spell out clearly what might be possible in their partnerships with local museums and any discipline-based art education program, regardless of where it is.

The Huntington's involvement with the Getty Institute has been continuous for the past five years, and we have grown to understand that change takes time. It takes responsiveness on the part of the museum staff and perseverance on the part of the teachers to provide effective visits that deal with teachers' needs within the discipline-based art education in the classroom.

At the Huntington, we have made some changes due to our involvement with the Getty Institute. It may not sound like much, but we started accepting kindergarten children through fourth-graders at the Huntington; previously, we had only served sixth-graders in our Huntington Art Gallery program and fourth-graders through high school students in our new American Gallery-The Virginia Steele Scott Gallery of American Art. These early requests from the Getty Institute teachers to visit the collections were easy to fit into our overall objectives of making the collections useful and available to teachers and their students. Clearly, in our regular programming, the Huntington had decided that younger-grade levels would not benefit as well from our tours as would the established sixth-grade students. We felt that younger students did not have the attention span to appreciate what we wanted them to learn. From that statement you will understand that we perceived our tours from a viewpoint stressing what we wanted them to learn rather than what the teachers might want their students to learn.

As a result of this, we attempted to lighten up and change our focus, to become more flexible and try a new approach. We started accepting students from kindergarten through fourth grade in a way entirely different from that of our structured tours.

We are accommodating the discipline-based art education identified schools and teachers in various ways. Some of the schools are readily accepted into our regular programs, if the grade level matches the requirements and the teacher wants regular tours. However, if a teacher has asked for special attention and has identified theirs as a discipline-based art education school, then I have handled the requests personally. Our staff is quite small -- two full-time people and one part-time person manage the entire school education program and other tour activities, with the help of a volunteer chairman and three hundred tour and docent guides. In speaking with the teachers and in some cases with the consultants who are working with the teachers and students, several things are made quite clear. First, and most important, is the need for an explanation that the visit will be a joint effort rather than a guided or docent tour; in other words, the teacher is required to do the visual scanning or visual awareness. We assign one docent per class, and that docent works with the teacher, helping conduct the tour as necessary and providing historical information. It is a team approach, and our docents report back so that we can understand how the program is going. I want teachers to share the visits and not turn them over to the museum staff. Two reasons for this are the size of our staff and our desire to help teachers use the collection on their own by giving them the responsibility of planning their visits more thoroughly. The students in this program sit on the floor, since I have to do without additional guard staff for those visits that are in addition to our regular programming. The docents and teachers are responsible for control. We request one adult per ten students, and usually the students arrive holding hands. At the younger-grade levels, we have had no discipline problems. The year we began, we had four brave teachers bring their classes, but this year we had fifteen teachers bringing more than five hundred students from four different school districts that are working with the program. Each teacher brings to the program his or her own style. Some are well into discipline-based art education, while others are just starting. Some teachers are still reluctant to share the tour and want the docent to do it all.

The Getty Institute program has brought more teachers to the Huntington, and special visits have been planned for their enrichment on Saturday mornings. We have been able to plan with the teachers what they would like to see and do. Usually, these visits meet the Huntington's earlier-stated objectives, making teachers more comfortable with our collections -- and they usually include a talk on our education programs, distribution of informational packets, an overview tour, and time to view the collections on their own. From two school districts sending their teachers on visits during the first year of the Institute to six districts sending their teachers on visits during the fifth year, we have been receptive to these requests. This is not to say that we didn't have teacher visits before, but there has been an increase of entire schools bringing their teachers because of the discipline-based art education program and its emphasis on museum visits.

Another special request was put into place at the Huntington when someone called to arrange an after-school visit. A district sent its teachers and

principals to the Huntington for a talk by our curator of American art. They met and then visited the galleries after it was closed to the public. We had never had a request like this before, and it was because of the Institute and its emphasis on museums that the request was even made.

A museum is also a place where a number of art historians and art specialists are employed, and these special art educators should be encouraged to provide enrichment opportunities for teachers using discipline-based art education when possible. Our art gallery staff has been asked to speak not only to the Institute participants during the summer program at the California Institute of Technology, but also at the site reviews in the fall. The ability of staff to do site lectures differs from museum to museum as well as from year to year. For instance, this year the Huntington curator of the Art Collections, Robert R. Wark, has been the only senior curatorial staff in our art collections. One of our associate curators is on maternity leave and our other associate curator has taken a position with the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts. Until summer, the Huntington does not have a staff that would be available for such enrichment; but, even so, Robert Wark recently agreed to talk with some principals about our American art collection at the request of the Getty Institute staff.

The realities of museum staffing must always be considered when designing or planning what each museum can do for the participants. A site visit by the museum staff, either during regular hours or after hours, will usually require an honorarium. Some art museum educators will plan it as part of their museum's mission.

In terms of changes that have been made from teacher requests, I would like to give you an example of what we were able to achieve at the Huntington. We have put into place a program from a need that was identified through the Getty Institute program. At one of the seminars put on by the Institute to provide a dialogue between art specialists in the schools and museum educators, the art specialists identified the need that most reproductions -- in the form of slides --- of our collections are not readily available. The request made for slides to be available on loan really concerns all museums. Many of the schools in the Los Angeles area cannot make museum visits. The art specialists needs slides so that reproductions of art works can be shown at the schools, in an attempt to encourage students to visit the museums on their own. This information was given to our development offices; we then wrote a grant and were funded by the California Arts Council for a slide loan program. This program is still in place, with slides being loaned at no charge to schools. This example points out a benefit for all museums that are heavily funded, and what better way to provide evidence for a program's need than through the teacher and school requests?

There is a challenge for all museum educators with discipline-based art education: that is, discipline-based art education will bring teachers to the museums who will have the confidence and sense of ease to ask for what they want and need, for things that we may not yet have prepared. We

should expect this to happen and should be responsive and willing to look at our programs and materials within the discipline-based art education guidelines and make changes whenever appropriate.

Students will come to our programs with a knowledge about art that did not exist before. Museums will need to restructure their tours and perhaps retrain their staff, whether volunteer or paid, to work with these changes. In some cases, an orientation or reminder about discipline-based art education will be all that is necessary, but with a special focus to communicate to the staff what is being taught in the schools so that plans and programs can be made jointly. There has been a tremendous change in the discipline-based art education schools that have used the Huntington. It has been a delight to see the changes from the very first visits with teachers unsure of the visual scanning process to a fifth visit with teachers as comfortable with the materials as are our docent staff. More teachers are using the museum on their own, using our programs when appropriate, as well as developing their own. They are asking for what they want.

I have seen no negative aspects to our partnership with discipline-based art education. If you want to call the gradual and often painfully slow process of educating teachers to the use of museums a negative, then so be it; but if we are to believe that it takes forty to fifty hours of in-service before a teacher is comfortable with discipline-based art education, then we are about on target. Certainly, I had imagined many more changes before now, in the sense of better-prepared students, many more teachers wanting to use our collections on their own, and more special requests from Getty Institute teachers. The Institute and discipline-based art education are building teacher literacy in art, and with that comes a challenge for the art museum educator. Discussing and planning ways to meet the needs of both teachers and the museum is what museum educators do best.

In the future, we will need to make room for more discipline-based art education teachers and students in our museum programs. We must plan for accessibility, not only to our collections, but to our staff. We must train our docents to be knowledgeable and understand discipline-based art education and how it is being taught in our local schools. For example, we will be having a program for art gallery docents on just what the Getty Institute is doing to art in the schools in the Los Angeles area and how it will affect their touring techniques -- or if it does affect those techniques. A better understanding and communication with discipline-based art education on all levels is necessary. After five years of our Los Angeles schools using discipline-based art education, if someone is teaching art in a museum they will need to know about discipline-based art education because the students coming to the museums are part of that program in Los Angeles. We will be having younger, increasingly better-educated students viewing our collections and taking our tours. As a result, many museums will need to rethink their programs based on grade level.

In summary, my role in the discipline-based art education program has been to make my institution accessible to the needs of both the Institute and the teachers and students who identify themselves to us as Getty or discipline-based art education schools. I have tried to deal with teachers and principals on a personal level, working out individual arrangements for each one of them. I view this as part of my job, since the Huntington has a commitment to teacher education. With such a commitment from the staff, the partnership and collaboration is easy. Our curator of the Art Collections, my mentor Robert Wark, has spoken to the participants each year, as have our associate curators. Our entire art museum professional staff has been on hand to give lectures to the participants in the summer Institute. In using museum staff and listening to many of the early lectures at the Huntington site, I have learned that the staff must be prepared in their presentations to talk with kindergarten through sixth-grade teachers. We found that several of the very first talks were prepared and presented in a manner appropriate for an art historian's peer group. The teachers were bored because the material was read and the vocabulary was not appropriate for the general classroom teacher. It takes a special art educator who talks frequently with the public to develop a really effective presentation. However, finding someone who can speak eloquently and simply about art (similar to Gombrich in his History of Art) is not an easy task. It will add much to your programs if you research the very best speakers in the field. Our aim is to excite and educate classroom teachers, rather than intimidate or bore them.

Teachers are excited about this entry into art education and are eager to learn. From the core of discipline-based art education teachers, many are returning to school for more art education. Knowing your audience is the key to the successful presentation for both art educators and most especially art educators presenting for the discipline-based art education program -- no matter where it is.

I have seen skepticism from my colleagues and docents when an ill-prepared teacher does not know how to look at a painting, but the teacher is there, with the students, and trying. We must help with these first-timers -- and they will reward us with future visits. Huntington docents who have worked in the "team" touring program for discipline-based art education teachers and students have seen very new, unsure teachers and teachers who have enough knowledge to be docents themselves. It is clear that this has been a program of learning for both the institution and the discipline-based art education teacher. Furthermore, it has been exciting to see our docents returning from working with first-and second-graders and saying, "I'll do that anytime; the kids were terrific and knew so much." One docent reported back that the kids had seen things through the visual awareness or scanning process that she herself had never seen before. I took some second-graders to see a Beauvais tapestry in our collection -- one of the Italian village scene pieces that had lost a lot of its color because of fading. Trees were barely visible in the distance, but the second-graders saw them and saw what little green was left in them. I found this marvelous.

In an earlier presentation for the Getty, I spoke of the museum educator's role as one of cooperation, making connections and collaborating in planning with the discipline-based art education teachers and students a better way to view the museum built upon their needs. I still think this is relevant. The list is endless of what can be offered to supplement the resources a teacher uses in the discipline-based art education program. To take an active role means taking charge and helping teachers and students use the museum and all the resources it has to offer. These resources differ from museum to museum, but all museums will benefit from a greater use of their collections. Discipline-based art education is exactly what our museums and art educators need.

THE ARTIST IN THE CLASSROOM

Joseph R. Goldyne
Artist, San Francisco

Many of us are still in the early stages of contemplating the current options in art education, but lately I have seen and read enough of the conceptual camps evolving around the issue of Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE) to know that ignorance truly has been bliss. As a working artist, heretofore not involved in art education, I have hesitated to participate in the debate for I do see merit on both sides of the issue: on the newly articulated side of those who favor quatrosecting the early exposure to art into aesthetics, art practice, art criticism and art history (disciplines which certainly do comprise what has become the world of art for many in the educated adult population), and on the side of those who would emphasize what has now become the traditional creative-expressive approach to teaching art.

As an artist-outsider looking in on the debate, knowing of inherent prejudices on the parts of competing factions and beginning to wonder about the artist's place in the classroom, I must ask, if only rhetorically, what I realize would be two sensitive, perhaps irritating, questions -- one directed to each of the approaches to teaching art and about art. I could begin by inquiring whether those who support the creative-expressive approach to the teaching of art in primary and secondary schools do so because of an ability or disinclination (based on limited personal schooling) to approach the task with the rigor desired by DBAE proponents, a rigor such discipline oriented advocates would defend as necessary to touch on the true fullness which art can provide for the life of man? Or, I could ask proponents of DBAE whether they are aligned with its approach rather because it helps considerably to enfranchise their personal disciplines and philosophies by making them part of the foundation curriculum for future generations? After all, we all want to make our life's work serious -- to feel that it is a significant expenditure of time and contributes to the betterment of this place. And, if we are to be straightforward and pragmatic about this quandary, we must also admit that DBAE might get art education onto a higher rung in the realm of academic studies and thereby benefit the status of art educators among their peers in the other humanities.

Despite their admitted edge, these questions are fair questions, because the possible ulterior motives suggested are perfectly understandable, even though they would be regrettable. But whatever the motives, the general directions have been set and what we should do about art in school is being debated. One glitch which has been referred to by others and concerning which I would like to express an opinion has to do with DBAE's subtitle: "Beyond Creating."[1] In the best interpretation, that subtitle is imperfect; in the worst, it is at once illogical and demeaning, for creating itself is the quintessential experience -- the ultimate act. Can there be anything beyond such a primary activity? Clearly, the preposition

"beyond" was intended only to mean that there was more than creating to be shared with students, and certainly there is more. But it would have been preferable to employ a less precariously ambiguous subtitle such as "Accompanying Creativity."

In quibbling about the word "beyond" the artist also reveals his prejudice; ambiguously it is on behalf of the primacy of the act of creating. But many others, even DBAE proponents, see this clearly as well and understand that the other art-related disciplines such as aesthetics, art criticism and art history are discursive and commence only when there is a work of art to discuss.

However, the knowledge and experience required to discuss and teach about these art-related disciplines, though part of the armamentarium of earlier artists, is often not part of the educational trappings of today's artist. The very fact that proclamations calling for artists and teachers with broad knowledge and training usually meets with shrugs of hopelessness tells me and you about the nature of the problem, which is that it is pervasive. Certainly, we are all aware that there is an intense, visible discussion of the state of education today and the matter of the relationship of pay scale to getting the best and brightest into teaching. Since the Nation at Risk report of five years ago, many have become aware of the perils for our country if there are not changes in the quality of teaching in general. So at this juncture, couldn't one fairly comment regarding the prospects for a revitalized art education that if we don't have teachers trained in knowledge as well as in method, we are jumping the gun calling for more complex programs in the schools? Stating it simply: if we want Renaissance students, we need Renaissance teachers.

DBAE is an attempt at renaissance in a field perceived by many to be powerless as an educational force. And, reading about DBAE certainly conveys a sense of excitement about possibilities for enriching a child's understanding of what art has been or can be for man. At the inception of this attempted renaissance, we find ourselves with a general curriculum which, as it has been said for years, trivializes art. Isn't it ironic, though, that art or facsimiles of art have never been more visible or discussed? In fact, the visual arts have never loomed larger in the public consciousness. Undoubtedly, this is not in small part due to the fact that over the past quarter century, museums have come to be governed by public relations concerns and increasingly, exhibitions are chosen for the draw they can command. Accompanying catalogues are frequently packed with color images providing impressive mementos of the event. Decorative posters too recall the most popular and often most beautiful objects and have become common in both the home and workplace, their frames usually costing considerably more than the posters themselves. It is not so shocking then when we learn that for some communities the "right" art has become a greater source of revenue than many sporting events. And certainly, it is in the nature of human response to the extraordinary that any artist, dead or alive, whose work can be sold for eight figures will achieve a place of prominence in the popular memory. By comparison, the power of traditional education to inculcate an awareness of the contributions of the visual arts

appears feeble, and the perception of the artist in the community at large, particularly in yuppie America, has not fared well.

But to blame the trivial stature of art in the curriculum entirely on the creative expressive legacy would be a grave injustice. My belief is that it is not the nonintellectual aura of creating and expressing artistically that have diminished the stature of the arts so much as it is the stereotype of their practitioner, the artist. The bohemian who grunts and paints or sculpts, dies and is resurrected because of tardy appreciation of his gifts, has been, all too often, the model conjured by the general public.

So, if the arts have been assigned a nominal role in the panorama of general education, it seems that we must understand that it is largely because the professional end product of artistic education -- the artist -- has not been judged a desirable goal by most parents and teachers. Indeed those who make the fateful choice almost always have stories of family unhappiness or personal fears about the decision.

The situation has been helped somewhat since World War II by collegiate hiring of artists. But it has been precisely the contrast between the artist community on campus and the rest of academia which I fear has implanted certain stereotypes in the minds of budding educators.

Let us examine this problem a bit further, for it is reasonable to consider philosophically who one is bringing into the classroom when one asks the artist to enter. Because I started out with a passion for art as a child, became enamored of the biological sciences and received an M.D., but finally came full circle into art again, I have some perceptions of critical differences between the artist's world and the worlds of other professions.

The artist's profession could be likened to an imaginary institution, very easy to enter, but exceedingly difficult to complete with satisfactory marks. With measurement an enormously problematic and largely irrelevant instrument, peer evaluation does not count for much. In fact, artists broadly supported in academia may not be considered of high rank by critics or historians. And artists favored by critics and historians may be ignored by serious artists as fashion plates. So to say one is an artist to a member of the public means almost nothing. "What kind of artist," will be the silent question. "I've never heard of this person; is the work good or bad, great or mediocre?" To answer that one is an artist is thus often puzzling and for the questioner, I do not doubt, somewhat discomforting.

The high visibility professions such as medicine and law, on the other hand, are like great universities to which it is very difficult and very expensive to gain access, but once admitted, relatively easy to stay aboard. Because of multiple levels of testing and peer review, to state that you are a physician or an attorney immediately connotes accomplishment. Accomplishment, however, is not the light that flashes

over the declaration: "I am an artist." To answer that one is an artist is a declaration beyond measurement. But when such an immeasurable entity enters the classroom, it is only fair for educators and parents -- people who measure as a means of understanding, hope and survival -- to ask what can this person offer?

To answer this, I first asked myself the simple question: "Do I believe that professional artists should confront and be confronted by young students?" The answer was an emphatic yes. Children confront and exchange ideas with doctors and lawyers, business people, professional athletes and even professional musicians with far greater frequency than they communicate with professional visual artists. That visual arts are one of the highly regarded and preservable expressions of a civilization seems to creep into adolescent thought, but its practitioners, unless dead, are rarely regarded as venerable. So, by all means, whatever one's opinion of the potential effectiveness of the artist as long term teacher of children, artists should meet and mingle with children.

Whatever position one takes at the outset regarding DBAE, I am certain that all would agree that good teaching in the creative-expressive tradition is better than bad teaching within the framework of DBAE. Like the authors of PROPEL, an alternative approach derived from DBAE, my own feeling is that for teaching to depend on a properly integrated program, derivative of both models, would be best of all. It will also be clear that because the creative-expressive act is what the artist was "born to do," it is only the level of his grounding in the other art-associated disciplines which becomes critical in assessing what his role in the classroom can be. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, any respectable artist would have had that grounding. Today, it is frequently missing.

Nevertheless, because I believe that in many important ways good artists can be the closest known adult life form to kids, it might seem that I would conclude that an ideal situation for the artist and child is to place them together. Well, indeed, I would like to conclude that, but the ideal situation of which I speak is uncommon because an artist's native gifts are so rarely poised for communication to children, unless a child can benefit from example alone (and some children can). The classroom can too easily become the site where a host of variables clash rather than a station for the sharing of inspiration. The variables include the visual motor sophistication of the students, their intellectual preparation for dealing with visual ideas, and the expectations of their parents and teachers. The artist may be verbally restrained or loquacious, but out of sync with the lingo of teaching as it is applied to the three R's. He or she may be an exemplar of great technical achievement, yet find it of little meaning to the artistic ambitions of primary schoolers.

But whenever the artist enters the classroom, a specialist in doing is brought into an environment largely devoted to explaining. The proponents of DBAE would have him explain more, and those favoring the creative-expressive orientation would have him do more. The former view would thus have him a pied piper, the other a professor. My view would be to have the

artist do what he is good at doing, and if he is prepared to do a range of teaching, as hopefully more artists will be within a generation, then he should be encouraged to do it, for to paint, draw or sculpt with episodic commentary on history and aesthetics could be as exciting a performance as listening to a great conductor lead a symphony orchestra through its paces while interrupting to comment on structure and technique. Just as the ear can join with the intellect to forge a heightened appreciation of the composer's art, so the eye and mind can link for some very exciting insights into the visual arts.

These are some of the things that an artist can do, but there are three things that I feel an artist must do to have unique and justifiable meaning in the classroom:

1) The artist as teacher of the young must preserve and nourish the child's sense of magic. Children love magic, love the element of surprise, for the apparently irrational teases their curiosity and nurtures their imagination, and more and more it disappears from their world. Do you remember the faces of the children when NASA's Challenger exploded or the narratives of homeless children on their condition? These were children whose world was too rapidly supplanting the magic of adventure with the reality of adversity.

The artist can help to allay the passing of magic from a world whose children are really desperate to retain it. He can employ media that provide a surprise in their respective processes. Printmaking, for instance, is such a process. Usually relegated to the college or high school studio, it is really an ideal medium for the younger person, because what comes out on the other side of the roller, from under the blanket, always has less or more than one believes has been contributed in the preparation of the image. The loss or gain is the surprise, and accepting or rejecting the results teaches important aesthetic and critical lessons. But the magic of printmaking can also yield other very real educational benefits. The long history of the graphic media and the relative availability of examples by past and present masters at local museums make historical discussions an enjoyable outgrowth of the classroom experience.

Also, etchings and drypoints, for example, can be done at home, as homework in the home environment, and returned to school for printing. For older children, school papers can be illustrated with intaglio prints just like books of the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries. When the child illuminates his early intellectual efforts made in fulfillment of the requirements of other disciplines, it is a wonderful way to merge art with those subjects given top billing in the curriculum. Examples of such mergers in the sciences and humanities from the past can be shown at the rare book room of the public library. Touching the past by working in the processes of the past is a wonderful way to build a sensitivity to history. I have elaborated on this area of artistic enterprise to show the way.

2) The artist must deal with great ideas -- great visual ideas; this will not intimidate, for children are rarely intimidated by adult

accomplishment. Rather they are energized by the possibilities. Highly significant visual statements are usually statements of grandeur or subtlety, and not necessarily the products of our Western civilization: Gericault's Raft of the Medusa or Zurbaran's Still Life with Lemons; an African Bambara antelope or Ashanti gold weight; Rodin's Burgers of Calais or a Joseph Cornell box; a seventeenth-century Japanese screen or a netsuke. These can teach volumes about the diversity of visual art and the many languages of inspiration, and thereby about the diversity of people.

The artist can talk about paintings in caves or on ceilings, on walls or in books; he can show children how people were inspired to think of the vault of heaven by paintings of heaven on earthly vaults. Discussing great portraits helps to initiate thinking about how the child feels when he or she looks at people. Judging how the artist felt by observing how he painted the sitter gives a wonderful introduction to human character and human relations as well and provides a lesson in the nature of subjectivity.

3) The artist must teach the child to be prepared for accident. This can be one of the most important lessons which art can provide, with applicability in all of the humanities and sciences. Let us remember that the discovery of Penicillin just like the discovery of lithography were accidents -- that Archemides principle and radiography were accidental discoveries. But in each case there was an eye open to the accident and a mind ready to accept the vision and act on it. All, like Archemides, could proclaim "Eureka" (I have found it). In overseeing the process of creating, the artist has the opportunity to alert the child to the important suggestive potential of accident or random occurrence and in so doing make him more cognizant of his environment and its unexpected riches.

One of the ways, for instance, to teach about the suggestive power of illusion on a two dimensional surface is to exploit the infinite shapes of pigment patterns which occur on the surface of water while making marble paper. One dips the paper only partially to give the marbled portion the outline of a hill or a flat plain. The unmarbled portion can be read as sky. The veined lines and dots can instantly be imagined as roads or bushes in a verdant or desert setting, and these can be accented or connected by colored pencils or pen. Endless vistas can be created, one after the other.

Because I feel that the artist must attend to the aforementioned lessons to have a raison d'etre in the classroom does not mean that I expect him to single-handedly speak for and about the visual arts. If only the historian spoke of history, it too would be eliminated from the essential curriculum. No, there must be broader participation, for every good game has fans as well as players.

Recently, it has occurred to me that there might be a way to proceed in addressing the business of art education which should attract more fans and be acceptable to both camps -- an approach which values the uniqueness of individual expression and delivers the disciplines relating to the arts

through already established channels. As in Chinese landscape painting of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the attempt would be to reach a harmonious merger of nature and culture: cultivating the natural expression of childhood while fostering insight into the structure, history and evaluation of artistic creation.

The thrust of DBAE has been to emphasize that acquiring significant skills and understanding in the arts is a complex process and that beginning in middle and secondary schools, trained art teachers could deliver quality instruction in the disciplines relating to the arts.[2] But I am afraid that such an approach alone will not give the arts the strength they must have to contribute significantly to the life of future students.

A biological model understood by more and more people suggests the alternative approach I would propose. It is nothing short of splicing aesthetics, the history of art, and criticism into the business of English, foreign language, history, math, and science -- already established channels. As in genetic engineering where a host cell can be made to instruct its chemical factory to retool for the production of a desired protein, we should begin to think of retooling the non-trivialized disciplines to produce curricula which pay serious attention to the fine arts. Another way to see the approach is as an early interdisciplinary program.

To give just a few examples: in the teaching of history, the High Renaissance could as easily be called the age of Leonardo, Michelangelo, and Raphael and be taught with at least two illustrations of important works by each of them. Study of certain third world countries could be enhanced by a discussion of the form and function of art as expressions of religious beliefs; English assignments could include essays on favorite painters, requiring specific details about selected works in addition to appreciative discourse.

Physics could devote some space to age determinations through explanations of radio carbon and thermoluminescence testing. Questions at the back of chapters could include specific problems relating to the determination of forgeries; mathematics problems, even in the early years, could deal with art-related subjects (e.g., it is believed that Rembrandt did about 3,000 drawings. The man who was the greatest scholar of Rembrandt's drawings wrote a book saying that he could only find 1,400 drawings. How many drawings are still missing? What do you think happened to those drawings? There are about 300 known paintings of Rembrandt; how many more Rembrandt drawings than paintings are there?).

This approach would be significant in the earlier years when one teacher frequently carries the entire day and it would be even more essential in the middle and secondary school years when there is a division of labor among several teachers. Topics relating to civic life, health, human relations, and politics come up in the humanities and science curricula all the time. It is time that art be given more than a walk-on role in the teaching of these disciplines. Yes, occasionally, one will see that some

attempt has been made to mention or illustrate art in the text of a non-art subject, but a truly concerted effort has to be made to integrate the art disciplines accompanying creativity into the core curriculum.

In my opinion, it is only when this interdisciplinary approach will be operational and artists will be seen in classrooms that art education will be able to rest easy. I am aware that there is much that wreaks of contention in terms of the relationship of the working artist, both as student and as teacher, to the academic disciplines, and this has not helped art education. Because of my own experiences, however, I see the potential for harmony and the harm of divisiveness; thus I have not dwelt on the many areas where classical disagreements occur, but on the strengths which one might expect of a well-educated contemporary artist in the classroom. For those disappointed by the paucity of inflammatory statements in these remarks, I might quote Alfred Hitchcock who said: "I must apologize for the lack of bloodshed in tonight's program. We shall try to do better next time."

Notes

1. Zessoules, Wolf and Gardner, "A Better Balance: ARTS PROPEL as an Alternative to Discipline-Based Art Education," Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art Education, University Council on Art Education, April, 1988, p. 120.

2. Elliot Eisner, " The Role of Discipline-Based Art Education in America's Schools," The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1986 p. 24.

THE ARTIST'S ROLE IN EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Richard Bell
National Program Director
Young Audiences, Inc.

If ever there was a time for initiating substantive change in the way young people are introduced to, and taught about the arts, this is that time. It has been five years since the release of A Nation at Risk, the seminal report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education. That document marked a change in the perspective of government and business leaders regarding the relationship between excellence in education and continues to reverberate both from within and outside the educational establishment.

Subsequent reports and policy statements issued by such diverse organizations as the College Board, the American Council for the Arts and the Getty Center for Education in the Arts have focused more intensively on the place of arts education in schools. The overriding theme of these reports reflects the need to establish the arts as a basic subject area and discipline worthy of the time and resources required to support sequential learning objectives, including the development of textbooks, curricula materials, testing strategies, trained personnel, and the establishment of the standards and criteria needed to implement such a massive effort.

The most recent, and perhaps what will become the most influential, document to date is the recently released report on arts education by the National Endowment for the Arts, Toward Civilization. This eloquent and persuasive text summarizes the present state of arts education throughout the nation, and presents a compelling list of recommendations that address the critical issues facing the arts education field today. Among its findings the report states:

> We have found a gap between commitment and resources for arts education and the actual practice of arts education in classrooms. Resources are being provided, but they are not being used to give opportunities for all, or even most, students to become culturally literate. The arts in general are not being taught sequentially. Students of the arts are not being evaluated. Many arts teachers are not prepared to teach history and critical analysis of the arts. (Forward, p. i)

The report proposes more than fifty recommendations in five major areas : curriculum development; testing and evaluation; teacher recruitment; preparation and training; research; and the need for leadership among the business, government, arts and education sectors in support of these areas.

All the recommendations are timely; most express the highest goals and aspirations of those already working in the field; many are provocative, in

the best sense, in that they provide a sense of direction along with sufficient specificity to facilitate both reflection and immediate action. A number have the ring of truth that is likely to stimulate significant support among the various constituencies addressed in the report, both in the immediate future and over the long-term. Consider the following:

> Arts education should provide all students with a sense of the arts in civilization, of creativity in the artistic process, of vocabularies of artistic communication, and of the critical elements necessary to making informed choices about the products of the arts. (p. 19)

> State education agencies and school districts should identify, and achieve consensus on, the minimum knowledge and skills (in terms of student learning outcomes) that would satisfy state or district mandated high school graduation requirements. (p. 19)

> As in other subjects, students should be tested in the arts and their art work evaluated in order to determine what they have learned, and arts education programs should be evaluated to determine their effectiveness. (p. 21)

> State certifying agencies should strengthen arts certification requirements for all teachers whose responsibilities include the arts. Training of all teachers -- elementary school classroom teachers, specialist arts teachers, and teachers of other subjects to which the arts are relevant -- should include i) study of important works of arts (their craft, history, and significance to the civilization which they symbolize) and ii) study of techniques for creating or performing one of the arts. (p. 22)

> State education agencies, with federal assistance, should develop procedures comparatively to evaluate district and school arts programs in relation to state arts education goals. Local school districts, with federal and state assistance, should do the same based on their curricula. (p. ii)

> The governance, education, arts and business-producer sectors should work together to convince parents and political and education leaders at the state, district, and local levels that education is complete and acceptable only when the arts are included as essential components sequentially taught. Making the case for arts education to state and local leadership is a political job requiring greater effort than for school subjects that large segments of the public already perceive to be basic. (p. 26)

In my remarks today, I would like to focus on the artist, the role artists have traditionally played in schools, and the role they should play in the future, particularly in relationship to the educational reforms outlined above.

The distinction between the goals and priorities of general education, arts education and arts-in-education is central to understanding the role that outside arts resources can play in educating students. Whatever we may think of the quality of education in America, the great majority of children do learn to read and write, to compute, and to understand the rudimentary principles associated with history and science. Education in these subjects exists within the time frames of daily instruction designed to achieve basic literacy in these disciplines.

Arts education is not an equal partner in the educational enterprise. Instruction in the arts is included in the curriculum, but not as a discipline in which basic literacy is the expected outcome. Content and continuity are sacrificed to the exigencies of time and budgetary constraints.

It is the imbalance between instruction in the arts and other subject areas that has created the context for artists working in schools (arts-in-education). There is nothing comparable in the educational arena; we don't find 'scientists in education' or 'mathematicians in education.'

This relatively brief tradition began shortly after World War II in the private sector with the inception of Young Audiences and other not-for-profit efforts designed to introduce young people to artists and to the arts. These programs were initiated as a supplement to, not as a substitute for, instruction in the arts. In 1965, the National Endowment for the Arts' enabling legislation established the arts-in-education concept in the public sector with the artist-in-schools program, which began placing artists in schools in 1970.

Arts in education is carried out by a loosely knit community of individuals and organizations with few common characteristics beyond the fact that they provide arts programs for young people. There are thousands of organizations in addition to school systems currently involved in arts education in towns and cities throughout the United States : arts agencies, producing arts institutions (including symphony orchestras, opera, dance and theatre companies, museums, numerous arts service organizations, and thousands of small ensembles and individual artists), universities, funding sources, and community support groups. The board members and supporters of these organizations represent a powerful and influential cross section of the American business, patron and political communities.

The spectrum of activities carried out by these organizations is almost as varied as they are numerous. Major categories of programs include: performances; performance demonstrations; workshops; residencies; artists in residence; teacher training. Unfortunately, there are virtually no reliable statistics which summarize the number and basic types of services

currently being offered by artists. However, the proliferation of arts-in-education services in school systems throughout the country since 1965 is testimony both to the quality of these programs and to their impact.

However, it is generally agreed that at the present time arts instructional programs and arts-in-education activities do not adequately reinforce one another. Despite the best efforts of both artists and arts educators, a compelling case for the value of the arts in everyday life has not been made forcefully enough to establish the arts as subjects worthy of daily instruction in schools. In the face of increased competition from other disciplines for time within the school day, the need to combine arts and education resources has taken on new urgency.

The absence of a common mission, agenda for action, or even a shared vocabulary among artists and arts organizations that produce educational programs reflects the diverse orientations and goals of the arts community. For instance, some artists and arts organizations produce educational programs as their main focus while others include such services as an ancillary activity.

The potential for achieving unity of purpose and creating more significant programs is further thwarted by the complexity and diversity that characterize the major types of organizations in the field: differences in function and style between the public and private sectors, among national, state and local agencies, between arts organizations and individual artists, and within the complex spheres of influence in higher education, elementary and secondary schools.

Considering the fact that the primary purpose of arts-in-education programs is to increase audience understanding and experience of the arts, the absence of these activities from the core programs of many of our leading arts organizations is incomprehensible when viewed from any considered perspective. However, we must resist the temptation to assign sole responsibility for this state of affairs to those within the arts community. Even the most reluctant among our arts leaders might recognize the need for quality arts education if a more compelling case was made for including artists and arts organizations at the center of educational reform. Clearly, this has not occurred.

Despite the important contribution made by artists in education over the past thirty years, the perception persists among educators and the general public that outside arts resources exist primarily to entertain rather than to educate. This perception can only be changed if arts educators work with artists to define clearer, more rigorous expectations regarding the role artists should play in sequential discipline-based curricula.

Most of the organizations in the arts community which produce educational programs share information, work cooperatively on special projects, and maintain friendly relations with others working in the field. We do not lack examples of partnerships among individual organizations; what is lacking is a comprehensive pattern of collaboration involving groups of

organizations working to meet the challenges facing the arts education field today. Many critical issues have yet to be adequately addressed. For example: How does one define what it means to be artistically literate? Is it possible to demonstrate the value of achieving this outcome? Are the resources available to get the job done? How can these resources be coordinated in community-wide efforts to this end?

Feelings of ambivalence regarding the need for arts education appear to be deeply rooted among artists and arts organizations. Few substantive programs have been undertaken in support of arts education by our leading arts institutions in the performing arts, fine arts, media arts, architecture and design. If we are "a nation at risk" regarding the general state of arts education, then artists and arts organizations are 'a community at sea' regarding the place of education in the artistic enterprise.

What we lack, and what is curiously missing in the proposals contained in "Toward Civilization," are specific strategies for strengthening arts-in-education programs within the arts community. Of the more than fifty recommendations outlined in this otherwise exemplary document, only six proposals make any reference to the role artists should play in addressing the critical issues presented in the report. Typically, those recommendations are general in nature --

> State education and arts agencies should work cooperatively with regional and local education and arts agencies, professional organizations, artists and arts institutions to provide leadership and support for improving arts education. (p.26)

-- and often have the quality of an afterthought --

> The experts should also engage the resources of artists, arts and cultural institutions, teacher-training institutions, and commercial producers of classroom arts materials. (p.20)
>
> Professional arts education associations, artists and arts organizations can help the coordinators in those efforts. (p.24)

In a single instance, a provocative idea is promulgated:

> In a time when we are likely to face a shortage of qualified arts teachers, state certifying agencies should develop and implement flexible procedures that provide for special testing and certification of experienced practicing artists and arts professionals who can demonstrate a comprehensive background in the arts and substantial knowledge of the issues and methodology of K-12 arts education. (p.23)

But even this proposal lacks the impact of the more specific strategic ideas which permeate the report's recommendations regarding the role of educational agencies and administrators, school boards, and classroom and specialist teachers.

The absence of specific expectations and a strategic agenda for the arts community is likely to reinforce artists' traditional ambivalence regarding their role in education. Most members of the arts community assume that the primary responsibility for developing educational priorities rests with teachers and school administrators. Although they may not hesitate to criticize the general educational condition, they are reluctant to become too deeply involved in the particulars of changing that condition. They often fail to recognize that the values inherent in the allocation of time and resources within the school day reflect the values of the larger society of which they are a part, that these priorities are subject to change, and that the arts community has a stake in the establishment of instructional programs of the highest quality.

Arts educators and governmental policy makers should not expect the arts community to expend considerably greater resources in this regard until the leadership of these organizations become convinced that establishing the arts as a basic subject in schools is a matter of enlightened self-interest. An essential first step in this process is to initiate dialogue and debate among arts leaders in response to specific recommendations regarding the artist's role in educational reform. While the recommendations contained in "Toward Civilization" and other reports and policy statements provide the larger, encompassing context necessary to this dialogue, the absence of specific proposals regarding the role of artists and arts organizations in these documents is likely to diminish opportunities for involving the arts community in the arts education agenda.

"Toward Civilization" presents a strategic overview and a detailed agenda for educators. But the report does not suggest to what extent artistic sensibilities should inform the goals, objectives and strategies of the arts education reform movement. Nor do we learn how artists' work as educational agents might contribute to their artistic growth.

Even a cursory examination of the policy recommendations made to date yields a number of considerations that parallel those which focus on the educator's role.

To facilitate our discussion let us consider the following hypothetical recommendations addressed to the arts community:

1) Arts organizations and arts agencies in the public and private sectors should adopt and implement explicit policies to establish arts education as an essential part of their identity. These policies should provide for programs in history and critical analyses as well as production and performance. Provision should be made for qualified personnel and the

support services and materials needed to develop such programs. Most importantly, these policies should define the role each organization will assume in order to help integrate the arts into school curricula.

2) Arts organizations and agencies in each community should work together to foster discussion and debate about the following critical issues:

a) What is the minimum level of exposure and training students should receive from outside arts resources?

b) What contribution should artists make to developing textbooks, artist and teacher training materials and audio-visual aids?

c) How should artists assess the strengths and weaknesses of the full range of programs provided by outside arts resources and their effectiveness as part of the regular instructional program?

d) What standards and criteria should be established for certifying arts organizations and individual artists who work in schools?

3) Arts organizations and agencies should consider allocating 15 percent of their overall budget in support of arts education programs.

4) Arts producing and arts service organizations should be designated as primary or supplementary resources to local school systems according to their level of income and the percentage allocated to educational activities. For example, if an organization's budget exceeds $1 million and at least 15 percent is allocated to educational programs, the organization would be classified as a primary arts-in-education resource. Organizations with budgets in excess of $100,000 would be supplementary resources. School systems should be responsible for providing 50 percent of the income required to underwrite programs by primary resources and 25 percent for supplementary arts-in-education providers.

5) Each arts organization should develop strategies for evaluating the effectiveness of their programs in relationship to the goals and objectives of their school system's instructional program.

6) State education agencies working jointly with state arts agencies should develop criteria for certifying arts organizations and individual artists who provide services to schools. Professional training of all artists should include educational requirements established by these agencies in cooperation with university faculties and professional training institutions. Requirements for those artists who will be engaged in the full range of arts-in-education programs should become progressively more rigorous, culminating in the certification of those who will assume responsibilities for instruction in sequential K-12 curricula as artist teachers.

7) Artists and arts organizations should initiate and participate in research projects in support of arts education programs, training and evaluation. Research priorities should be established in consultation with the arts and education communities in the public and private sectors. Primary consideration should be given to: a) defining outcomes for performance, workshop, residency and artist-in-residence programs; b)

establishing a balance between performance, critical analysis and historical context in arts-in-education programs; c) creating model video and audio materials in support of these programs; d) developing new strategies for integrating arts in education services with instructional programs; e) establishing rigorous, yet flexible criteria and strategies for certifying artists and arts organizations; f) surveying arts and education programs currently being implemented in the field -- by community, regionally and nationally; g) creating new works specifically designed for young people; h) initiating long-term studies documenting the relationship between high quality arts education programs, success in other subject areas, and subsequent involvement in the arts as trustees, volunteers, hobbyists, and audience members.

8) And finally, national arts and arts service organizations in the public and private sectors should make every effort to orient and educate their various constituencies regarding the arts education agenda, with particular emphasis on providing information and strategies to help define the role of artists, arts agencies and organizations in educational reform.

Before closing, let me say a few words about the balance between performance, critical analysis and historical context in arts-in-education programs.

Artists are prepared to approach their work in schools from each of these perspectives because their work as artists requires this. Most artists are intensely interested in critical analysis and the historical context of their work, particularly those who take on the primary creative roles (playwrights, composers, choreographers, visual artists, directors, and actors). If these approaches are absent from artists' work in schools, it is primarily due to the lack of specific expectations and requests by sponsors and educators.

There is nothing intrinsically lacking in artists' abilities or inclinations in this regard. With few exceptions, it is the second-rate artist who is uninterested in examining the components of his work or exploring the larger, encompassing contexts which inspired it. Artists are among the most notable examples of those whose education continues throughout their professional life. The educational process is organic to the creative process. While artists often may not choose to articulate the role that critical analysis and historical context play in their work, these considerations are vital to artistic production and presentation.

Of course, artists often resist the academic penchant to isolate critical analysis and historical context as distinct and separate considerations apart from their work. There is no unified approach or body of knowledge that every painter, or actor or dancer will know and practice. The artists' vision in this regard is often skewed; they focus on those aspects of events and ideas that interest or move them. They may have little regard for critical analysis as an art historian might define it. As a result, their research, and therefore their knowledge about a given period or event, is often limited in breadth if not in depth. It is precisely

this characteristic that makes the artist's perspective so valuable in the classroom; highly personalized, intensely committed to a point of view, the artist can add a unique perspective to the broad, objective truths that are the pedagogic touchstone for most teachers and school administrators.

Finally, in closing, let me say that in my opinion it is vital that the arts community assume leadership in determining the artist's role in educational reform. The issues that I have touched upon this morning do not represent a comprehensive survey of all those that should be considered; rather they are offered as a point of departure for discussion, reflection and debate. My concern in this regard is twofold. First, the arts community must not abdicate its responsibility to join in the effort to establish the arts as basic subjects in public school curricula; and second, arts educators should make every effort to include artists and arts organizations as an essential component of educational reform. To engage in this undertaking is more than a matter of enlightened self-interest on the part of artists and educators; it is the least we can do in support of a civilized society.

APPENDIX B

Lists of Participants

ROUNDTABLE I
List of Participants

Rita Altman
Associate Superintendent for Curriculum
School Districts of Pennsylvania

June Arey
Pennsylvania Council on the Arts

Fred Bacon
Art Chairperson
Philadelphia City School District

Harry Bonelli
Arts Coordinator
Philadelphia City School District

Nancy Brookschmitz
Chairman, Department of Art in Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

David Campbell
Assistant Executive Director
Delaware County Intermediate Unit 25

Kellene Champlin
Director of Art Education
Fulton County Board of Education

Anthony DeFurio
Chairman, Art Department
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Matthew Dooley
Young Audiences of Eastern Pennsylvania

David Ecker
Professor, Department of Art and Art Education
New York University

Ed Erdman
Curriculum Director
Parkland School District

Mary Erickson
Professor of Art Education
Kutztown University

Ed Ferszt
Director of Continuing Education
The University of the Arts

Marsha Friedmutter
Director, Office of Cultural Arts
New York City Board of Education

James Gervan
State Supervisor of Art and Music
Delaware State Department of Public Instruction

Bonnie Gevortz
James Sullivan Elementary School

Jerry Greenfield
Chairperson, Department of Art Education
The University of the Arts

Edith Gwathmey
Bank Street School for Children

Thomas Hatfield
Executive Director
National Art Education Association

Enid Haupt
School Administrator

Anne Kaplan
Director
Philadelphia Center Great Lake College Association

Nathan Knobler
Sculptor and Faculty Member
The University of the Arts

Margaret Lewis
Assistant Curator of Education
Allentown Museum of Art

Kathleen N. Lockhart
Educational Specialist of Fine Arts
Maryland Institute College of Art

Laura MaGee
Coordinator for Arts Education
Pittsburgh City Public Schools

Barbara McGeary
Arts Supervisor and Director of
Riverdale Center for the Arts
Harrisburg City Schools

Clyde McGeary
Chief, Division of Arts and Sciences
Bureau of Curriculum Sciences and Instruction
Pennsylvania Department of Education

Earl McLane
Director of Art
Reading School District

John McLaughlin
American Council for the Arts

Carolyn Metcalf
Art Programs Coordinator
Philadelphia Alliance for Teaching Humanities
in the Schools

Donald A. Parks
Director
Delaware State Art Education Association

Carol Parsinen
Director
Philadelphia Alliance for Teaching Humanities
in the Schools

Henry Pearlberg
Arts Coordinator
Neshaminy School District

Thomas D. Ritenbaugh
President
Pennsylvania State Art Education Association

Susan Rodriguez
Overbrook High School

Sue Rosenthal
High School for Creative and Performing Arts

Prabha Sahasrabudhe
President
New York State Art Education Association

149

Hilda Schoenwetter
Director
Moore College of Art

Amy Snider
Chairman, Art Education
School of Art and Design
Pratt Institute

Peter Solmssen
President
The University of the Arts
Philadelphia College of Art

Portia Sperr
Director
Please Touch Museum for Children

John Straus
Chairman, Arts Education Advisory Committee
American Council for the Arts

Steve Tarantal
Dean
Philadelphia College of Art and Design

Ron Topping
Head/Arts
Education House

Gene Van Dyke
Chairman, Art Department
Cumberland Valley High School

Joseph Volp
Russell Conwell School

Barbara Weinstein
Art Supervisor
Allentown School District

Elaine Weinstone
Art Teacher
Springside School

Elaine Wickens
Bank Street Colleges

Elaine Wilson
Art Supervisor
West Shore School District

Peggy Wright
Coordinator
Delaware Arts Council

Victor Zarzycki
Dean of Students
The University of the Arts

151

ROUNDTABLE II
List of Participants

Mr. Kent Anderson
Hales Corniers, Wisconsin

Mr. William Benson
President Elect
Wisconsin Art Education Association

Dr. Curtis Carter, Director
Haggerty Art Museum
Marquette University

Ms. Ken Cottingham
Director of Art
West Allis Public Schools, Racine

Ms. Lee Devereux
Head, Public and Volunteer Activities
The Huntington Library Art Collections

Dr. Richard Doornek
Art Coordinator
Milwaukee Public School District

Dr. Nancy Hunt
Head of Supervision
Racine Unified School District

Mr. Darrell Jacobs
Principal
Elm Creative Arts School, Milwaukee

Ms. Kate Johnson
Curator of Education
Minneapolis Institute of the Arts

Mr. Al Kaczmarek
Principal
Golda Meir School, Milwaukee

Mr. Joe Kennedy
Principal
Milwaukee High School of the Arts

Ms. Josephine Koebert
Principal
Roosevelt Middle School, Milwaukee

Mr. Robert Johnson
Bureau of Art
Department of Curriculum
Chicago Public Schools

Ms. Barbara Brown Lee
Director of Education
Milwaukee Art Museum

Mr. Kent Lydecker
Director, Museum Education
Art Institute of Chicago

Ms. Donna Newgord
Curator of Education
The Charles Wustum Museum of Fine Arts

Mr. Morgan Paine
Gallery Director
Alverno College, Milwaukee

Mr. Bruce Pepich
Director
The Charles Wustum Museum of Fine Arts

Ms. Mary Lee Peters
Madison, Wisconsin

Ms. Jean Lorrignin Puls
Education Coordinator
John Michael Koehler Art Center

Ms. Margaret Fish Rahill
Museum Director
Charles Allis Art Museum, Milwaukee

Ms. Jeanne Schuldes
Supervisor of Education
Neville Public Museum, Green Bay

Ms. Anne Sullivan
Madison, Wisconsin

Ms. Susan Talbot-Stanaway
Curator of Education
Paine Art Center and Arboretum, Oshkosh

Ms. Carolyn White Travanti
Art Office, Milwaukee Public Schools

ROUNDTABLE III
List of Participants

Mary Kay Ball
Oklahoma PTA

Paulette Black
Mississippi Museum of Art

Lynn Clark
AIE Artist

John Clinton
AIE Artist

Kim DuBoise
Art Department
Pearl River Junior College, Mississippi

John Everitt
Executive Director
Arts and Humanities Council of Tulsa

M.J. Figard
Bartlesville Public Schools

Gary Goree
Fine Arts Coordinator
Tulsa Public Schools

Wilmantine Griffin
AIE Artist

Carole Haralson
Program Director
Philbrook Museum of Art

Ellen Hartman
Executive Director
Oklahoma Alliance for Arts Education

M.J. Henderson
AIE Coordinator

Glen Henry
Arts Management

Christine Houk
Chairman
Very Special Arts-Oklahoma

James Huelsman
Arts Education Director
State Arts Council of Oklahoma

Ellen Jonsson
Assistant Director
State Arts Council of Oklahoma

Virgil Lampton
Associate Professor of Art
University of Tulsa

Harley Manhart
Associate Director
Arts and Humanities Council of Tulsa

Sharon McColl
AIE Artist

Bill McVay
Oklahoma City Public Schools

Mitch Mertes
John Marshall High School

Charles Mohr
AIE Director
Oklahoma State Department of Education

Dr. Audrey Eleanor Oaks
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Oklahoma State University

Annette Pate
AIE Artist

Dr. Melvin Platt
President-Elect
Oklahoma Music Educators Association

Mary Reid
Administrator of Curriculum Services
Oklahoma State Department of Education

Barbara Reskovac
AIE Project Director
Lawton Public Schools

Judy Roberts
AIE Artist

Ann Shanks
Representative
Oklahoma Health, Physical Education,
Recreation and Dance

Linda Stilley
Tulsa Public Schools

Gaylund Stone
AIE Artist

Jimmie Ray Terry
Training Specialist
Oklahoma State Department of Education

Kathy Tosolini
Fine Arts Coordinator
Oklahoma City Public Schools

Clark Wiens
Sapulpa Arts, Cedar Creek

Georgia L. Williams
Artists-in-the-Schools Coordinator
Arts and Humanities Council of Tulsa

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

THE J. PAUL GETTY TRUST

Harold M. Williams
President and Chief Executive Officer

Leilani Lattin Duke
Director, The Getty Center for Education in the Arts

ROUNDTABLES

The roundtables are organized and coordinated by Ogilvy & Mather Public Relations/West, Los Angeles, California.

Direction and Facilitation
Valsin A. Marmillion

Staff Assistance
Anne Elmajian
Daylanne Johnson

DOCUMENTATION

The proceedings summaries are developed by Keens Company, New York, New York.

Project Director
William Keens

Project Associates
Lisa Parr
Bennett Ramsey

THE GETTY
CENTER FOR
EDUCATION
IN THE ARTS

1875 Century Park East, Suite 2300, Los Angeles, California 90067-2561

BEST COPY AVAILABLE